LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAY 27 1954
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
JX1952
.M96

A Way of Survival

A Way

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
MAY 27 1954
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

ARTHUR W. MUNK

# of Survival

BOOKMAN ASSOCIATES

New York

Copyright, 1954, by Arthur W. Munk

MANUFACTURED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
PRINTED BY RECORD PRESS, NEW YORK, N. Y.

DEDICATED TO

THE HALLOWED MEMORY OF MY GREAT TEACHER
DR. EDGAR SHEFFIELD BRIGHTMAN
FORMERLY BORDEN PARKER BOWNE
PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN
BOSTON UNIVERSITY

Preface

This writer does not profess to be a historian, a political scientist, or a diplomat. He tends rather to view all problems in terms of social philosophy, ethics, and theology. Yet, next to philosophy and theology his chief interests have always been history and international problems, especially the all important problem of world peace. What follows is the result of many years of agonizing reflection on this, the crucial issue of our age.

In fact, this book was written out of a sheer sense of urgency. The development of the atomic bomb, the menace of bacterial weapons, and now that monstrosity, the hydrogen bomb—these things, together with the failure to achieve any real international harmony and the danger of the nations being once more conditioned for the insanity of war, are signs enough to every thoughtful mind that mankind is in mortal danger of taking a last fearful step toward unparalleled disaster.

Even if a pitiful remnant should perhaps survive a possible Third World War, it becomes increasingly certain that civilization has little chance to survive. Mankind would revert to savagery. Thus, as the title of this book suggests, our basic problem, before which all others pale into comparative insignificance, is *survival*; not only mere physical survival but also the continuance of those values which we cherish.

Still we must not allow our fears to master us; that would be the quickest and easiest way to the very doom which must be averted at any cost. While our human situation is indeed grim and even desperate, it is not hopeless. Somewhere between optimism and pessimism, between hope and hopelessness, we must find our way toward what Toynbee would call a creative response.

The reader who expects a panacea, a soft easy way out of the world's dilemma, will be disappointed in this book; for the way to peace is complex and manifold rather than simple, and hard and rugged instead of easy. It demands sacrifice in terms of thought and dogged, persistent effort. Today and for some time to come the chief task of all sane men will be that of keeping mankind from that last idiotic step into the bottomless pit of a Third World War.

The most disheartening and dangerous aspect of the present situation is that, in spite of certain hopeful tendencies and possibilities, we are moving in the direction of war rather than away from it. There is a place in the Niagara River where it is impossible to turn back no matter how frantically the swimmer may struggle. The human race has not yet reached this place of no return; but it is fast approaching it—so fast that peace must be the chief concern of all men and especially of those in positions of authority.

What is needed above all else is a determined and decisive movement away from war and in the direction of peace. This calls for two things: men must be properly alerted as to the utter gravity of the present crisis and the impossibility of running away from it, and at the same time, lest they despair, they must be given a creative alternative. As a solution to international problems, nothing is more certain than the fact that war is archaic; it represents nothing short of man's final despair when he has ceased to think and to hope. Even in the past, before man was cursed with such suicidal weapons, it usually created more problems than it solved, thus setting the stage for the next conflict which was often a vulture-like struggle between the victors over the spoils. At any rate, whatever merit war may have had in the past as the final arbiter of the fortunes and destinies of nations, today, by virtue of its diabolical destructiveness and horrors, it stands condemned before the judgment bar of the enlightened reason and conscience. Only wishful thinkers and misanthropes after the order of Adolf Hitler still seek refuge in the fantastic monstrosity of modern warfare.

Yet, in spite of its destructiveness, its horrors, and its futility, there may be another great world conflict; not because men desire it and satanically devise it, but because they may again, as so often before, blunder into it. With little regard for taking time to investigate the real causes of war, the mass of mankind has gone merrily

on its way fascinated by the things of the moment until the sheer weight of unsolved problems and unresolved crises and difficulties has carried it over Niagara.

The chief purpose of this book is to awaken mankind both to the dangers and the possibilities inherent in the present world situation. It is aimed at both the scholar and the ordinary reader, since both must be aroused to a creative response if catastrophe is to be avoided. If this venture contributes even a mite toward causing men to cease moving in the direction of catastrophe and to begin moving in the direction of perpetual peace, the author shall be satisfied.

Many teachers and friends have made contributions. I must acknowledge my indebtedness to my colleagues on the Faculty at Albion College, and especially to Dr. Royal G. Hall, formerly Henry M. Loud Professor of History. Dr. Henry Hitt Crane, the distinguished Pastor of the Central Methodist Church, Detroit, offered many helpful suggestions in terms of the ethical and religious aspects of the problem. Mr. Herman Wills and Dr. Carl Soule of the Board of World Peace of the Methodist Church, and Dr. J. Burt Bouwman of the American Friends Service Committee likewise made valuable contributions. Appreciation is also due to Miss Norma Hammond, Mr. David D. Morris and the other members of the Albion College Library Staff for their kindness in making books available, to Mrs. Ann Hill Horn for her careful work in typing the second draft of the manuscript, to my brother-in-law, Mr. Robert E. Stalcup, for reading the final draft, and to Miss Nancy Lou Collier for assistance with the galley proofs.

This writer is grateful to the many publishers who generously gave permission to quote from their publications. Full credit has been given in footnotes. For the benefit of the reader who is interested in further pursuit of the problem, a bibliography has been provided.

ARTHUR W. MUNK

Albion, Michigan
November, 1953

Contents

Page

PREFACE 7

PART I

TOWARD AN ADEQUATE PHILOSOPHY OF PEACE

Chapter

I. MATERIALISTIC PHILOSOPHIES OF POWER 15
1. Origin and Nature of the Dominant Philosophies 15
2. Relation to the Present Crisis 20
3. Limitations, Defects, and Consequences 22

II. OTHER DANGEROUS PHILOSOPHIES 29
1. Fatalistic Philosophies 29
2. Escapist Philosophies 32
3. Relativistic Philosophies 37
4. Dogmatic Absolutism 41

III. ESSENTIALS OF A PHILOSOPHY 45
1. Universality and Comprehensiveness 46
2. The Absoluteness of Truth and the Moral Law 48
3. A Central Humanism and Personalism 51
4. A Purposive Universe 53
5. A Realistic Idealism 58

PART II

TOWARD AN ADEQUATE PEACE STRATEGY

IV. THE SUPPOSED ENEMY AND THE REAL ENEMY 65
1. The Supposed Enemy 65
2. The Real Enemy: A Third World War 71

V. A Synoptic Approach to Peace 92
1. The Need of a Synoptic Approach 92
2. Immediate Versus Basic Causes of War 95
3. Coping with the Basic Causes 97

VI. Signs of Hope 119
1. The Hope of Hopelessness 119
2. An Increasing Knowledge of Causes 120
3. Man's Growing Vision of Peace 121
4. The Advent of a New Age 125
5. Stars in the Night 128

VII. The Essentials of Strategy and Action 133
1. Our Great Need: Thoughtful Action 133
2. Eight Steps Toward Perpetual Peace 134
3. In Conclusion 146

Bibliography 149

Index of Persons 157

Index of Subjects 161

Part I

TOWARD AN ADEQUATE PHILOSOPHY OF PEACE

CHAPTER ONE

Materialistic Philosophies of Power

Today a world which is trying desperately to achieve unity faces the dire possibility of being split into two hostile camps. There are times when it seems to be little more than a vast stage upon which two hostile forces contend for mastery, each frantically seeking to draw everything into its orbit. If this conflict continues much longer, the final result may be an Armageddon more frightful than any ever pictured by the wildest and most fantastic apocalypsts.

Yet the philosopher is compelled to look deeper than this struggle of titans to discern the underlying ideologies and philosophies. For it is certain that human behavior, both in its individual and in its social manifestations, cannot be understood merely in terms of surface appearances. Moreover, if man is an animal, he is a most unusual one—a reflective animal. This is especially true in times of stress and strain, such as the contemporary scene when the turn to philosophies both crude and refined is inevitable.

1. ORIGIN AND NATURE OF THE DOMINANT PHILOSOPHIES

The governing philosophies of the twentieth century are undoubtedly philosophies of power. Many interacting factors and causes are responsible for these tendencies. Historically, however, they are related to materialism and naturalism and can be traced back to certain ancient Greek thinkers.

Denying the existence of a Creator and a Divine Purpose, Democritus (c.460-360 B.C.) and his followers held that the universe and all that it contains result from the motions and combinations of small, hard, indivisible material atoms. Though no materialist, Heraclitus (c.536-470 B.C.) was so impressed by the fact of change and flux that he went so far as to declare strife or war as "the father of all and the king of all." Nor can it be doubted that the

modern exponents of power politics find their forerunners in the worst of the Sophists. The case for might making right was never better stated than by the Sophist who speaks in Plato's *Republic.*[1]

Many centuries later Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527) in his little book *The Prince,* preached a similar philosophy of power and left a deep impression upon political thinkers and statesmen. In fact, modern politics has been largely Machiavellian. Likewise, Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), the English philosopher, developed a fascistic and totalitarian philosophy. However, unlike Machiavelli, he was a metaphysical materialist; like Democritus he tries to explain everything in terms of matter in motion.

Perhaps the prince of all the modern power philosophers is the German, Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900). For him the only ultimate is the will to power.[2] Though he would not have approved of some of Hitler's practices, there can be no doubt but that he influenced the Nazi leader.[3] Nietzsche also influenced Oswald Spengler, the brilliant, pessimistic and fatalistic philosopher of history who died in 1936. Unimpressed by what philosophers have called the higher nature of man, Spengler frankly calls man "a splendid beast of prey, brave, crafty, and cruel," whose chief passion is to strive for mastery regardless of the cost.[4] Moreover, history is basically tragic; before its final collapse the strong man appears. "He whose sword compels victory here will be lord of the world." [5] Thus the close relation of his philosophy to Hitlerism is unmistakable.

The most aggressive modern philosophy is the Dialectical Materialism of Karl Marx. In spite of its name, it has certain idealistic factors derived partly from Hegel and partly from the Jewish-Christian element in its environment. These idealistic factors consist of the belief that history is a process of development toward an ultimate goal, the classless society, and the emphasis on economic justice for the workers.

Basically, however, as the name implies, Dialectical Materialism is naturalistic and materialistic. There is no God or Divine Purpose. Not Mind but matter or nature is the source of all things. Moreover, economic forces really take the place of God in determining the course of history and the fate of man and of nations. History is primarily a series of class struggles until the ultimate goal is

reached. Thus, as a result of the struggle of the bourgeoisie (the middle class) with the feudal lords, feudalism fell and capitalism took over. In like manner, capitalism is inevitably doomed. During its last stages decay will set in and it will seek to crush the rising new order of the proletariat (the workers); but it will not succeed. In fact, the proletariat will crush capitalism eventually and establish their dictatorship as a necessary prelude to the advent of the new age—the classless society blessed with abundance.

Fundamentally then, in spite of its idealistic aspects, the Marxian system must be regarded as a philosophy of power. In common with all materialisms there is too much emphasis on things and physical forces. With this belief in the ultimateness and finality of impersonal forces, it is no wonder that the individual is all but lost in the clash of class with class, and its totalitarian and violent tendencies are also understandable. Material forces and processes are massive and they have a tendency toward violent eruptions with no apparent consideration for personalities. Yet it must not be forgotten, that as over against Fascism and Nazism, Marxian Communism seeks to abolish war and envisages an ultimate goal toward which the convinced communist believes the whole creation moves.[6]

No one can deny that American democracy is based on lofty principles, and that American philosophy has likewise been basically idealistic. This idealism has found expression in the passion for liberty and the sacredness of personality, and also in the social concern which has launched many a crusade. Today, however, sensitive citizens are becoming painfully aware of the danger of losing this heritage through our devotion to materialistic philosophies of naked force.

Werkmeister has pointed out that before 1900 the dominant philosophical tendency in America was idealistic and theological. But after 1900 idealism was increasingly on the defensive and by 1930 naturalism became dominant.[7] This writer would not go so far as to say that our philosophical naturalists are primarily to blame for America's devotion to the cult of power. Many of them are, in fact, humanistic and even idealistic as far as their ethics are concerned; that is, in spite of their naturalistic metaphysics.[8] Some of them, such as Dewey and Roy Wood Sellars, have also

been outstanding crusaders for democracy and peace. Again, no modern naturalist is a materialist in the old Greek sense; for the new energy theory of matter has destroyed this older materialism forever.

Still, when all is said and done, our naturalists are partly to blame. In spite of all their endeavors to find a real place for mind and values within the narrow bounds of their systems, they have failed miserably. More than this, they are still materialists at heart; since they are emphatic in their rejection of God and Divine Purpose. Rejecting Mind as the key to the nature of the universe, they are of necessity forced back to the ultimateness and finality of non-mental forces or matter. Some of them also tend toward behaviorism, conceiving mind quite mechanically as little more than a sum of mechanical reactions.[9]

Thus, the end result of naturalistic philosophies is an undue emphasis on the physical, the material, and the mechanical. In fact, several generations of students have been so deeply steeped in naturalism and materialism that they think largely in terms of its limited categories. The result has been a loss in depth and creativeness that is deplorable. Moreover, these philosophies have affected the man on the street. For it must not be forgotten that naturalism is one of the most influential or perhaps the most influential philosophy in the United States; and while few venture to read the more profound writings of the outstanding naturalistic philosophers, still their influence comes to the popular mind indirectly for the most part, through novelists, poets, the screen, and in many other ways.[10]

It may be well to ask why there should be such a surge of naturalism and materialism, not only in the United States but also throughout the world. As an unrepentant idealist, this writer does not believe that it is due to the superior reasonableness or truth of naturalism, but rather to the influence of two other forces whose exaggerated prestige must pass if mankind is to remain creative or perhaps even survive. The first of these is modern industrialism with its vast multiplication of things and the opportunities for amassing great wealth. The result has been the emphasis on things and especially on money as the only standard of value. In itself industrialism is good rather than evil, since it makes possible the

eventual conquest of poverty; but the things which it produces must be seen in true perspective as the means of life and of the common welfare, rather than as the ends.

The second is modern science. Again, it must be said that in itself science is good rather than evil, since it is man's only means of deliverance from the tyranny of nature. Still, it is far from an unmixed blessing, as modern man is beginning to discover. Science contributes to materialism and the philosophies of power in many ways.

First of all, without the inventiveness of science, industrialism and the multiplication of things would not be possible. Second, the possibility of controlling nature and the many devices which it makes possible has so fascinated many of the best minds that they have specialized to the point of becoming "intellectual robots." Neglecting the broad avenues of culture, they doom themselves to think in narrow mechanistic lines. The result is to have little understanding or appreciation of moral and spiritual values and to regard nothing as real except the physical processes which they seek to control.[11]

Finally, though science has destroyed the older crude materialism of Democritus, it tends to deliver us into the hands of the dangerous philosophies of power more completely than ever. For while, by means of the new energy theory of matter, it has disproved the old hard atoms, at the same time the splitting of the real atoms seems to reveal a wild, dangerous, frightening universe with no ultimate except atomic energy. In other words, it now seems that at the basis of things is nothing substantial or unchangeable but mysterious, restless, wild displays of power and ceaseless change, blind force without rime or reason.

Today, then, the universe appears to be even more Heraclitean than in the days of Heraclitus, thus seemingly furnishing a strong metaphysical basis for the philosophies of sheer power. When to this are added certain aspects of the nature of man and of the course of history as seen through the eyes of thinkers such as Spengler, the case for these philosophies seems very strong indeed. They appear to be in harmony with the very nature of the universe. Later, however, we shall see fit to challenge them in terms of cer-

tain significant facts which they either ignore or else pass over lightly.

2. RELATION TO THE PRESENT CRISIS

Thus far consideration has been given primarily to the dominant philosophies from the standpoint of thinkers, with slight mention of their effect upon the masses. In spite of idealistic professions, most individuals in this industrial age with its vast multiplication of things, are materialistically inclined. More than this, they are fascinated with the tremendous power which science has placed into man's puny hands.[12] As a result it is easy for them to believe that naked physical power is in some sense the ultimate court of appeal.

This conviction is greatly strengthened by the more sophisticated materialism of the intellectuals. The man on the street is glad that adroit, clever men also question the ultimate reality of spiritual forces and regard matter, energy, physical power as the only ultimate. Hence it becomes easy to thrust ideas and ideals aside as largely useless, as impractical appearances, and to place one's faith in the efficacy of sheer military might. As a result, more and bigger bombs and less skillful diplomacy seem to be the order of the day.

Few in the West will doubt Russia's faith in armed might. If pressed for proof, they need only quote Stalin's words at Yalta when some reference was made to the attitude of the Pope: "How many divisions does he have?" [13] They will also hasten to point out how this faith in military power is directly related to the underlying, impersonal, materialistic philosophy known as Dialectical Materialism.

At any rate, nothing is more evident than the fact that ever since Stalin ousted Leon Trotsky, Russian Communism has become increasingly more nationalistic; for with the former's advent to supreme power Russian patriotism has been revived to the extent of the state once more becoming an object of reverence, a kind of absolute.[14] This tendency was greatly enhanced by the war which led the people to the point of almost deifying Stalin and his victorious generals, a trend which fits in admirably with a philosophy of power. Consequently, even though Marxian Communism, unlike Fascism and Nazism, does not regard war as an end or goal,

yet as it becomes devoted to the philosophy of power it will, of necessity, become more militaristic and not unlike its bitterest enemies. In defeating Hitler, did the spirit of Hitler really defeat and capture Stalin?

Russia's devotion to the principle of power is likewise evidenced by her stubbornness at the peace table, her vast armament program, and her support of the North Koreans and the Chinese. Since Stalin's death, it is true that there are signs of a shift of policy in the direction of peace through diplomatic action and an understanding with the West. Yet, she has been so wedded to power politics that even sincere moves are misinterpreted; though it must be added that, in spite of these apparently sincere moves toward peace, the emphasis on armed might is still present as much perhaps as ever. While in the left hand Russian leaders hold the olive branch, in the right they grasp a mighty sword which creates suspicion and fear in the West.[15]

But the Americans, of all people, have the least occasion to point the finger of scorn at their enemies. Their basic philosophy, as exemplified in their foreign policy (that is, insofar as they have a consistent policy), is also this same belief in the ultimateness of power. Nothing is more disquieting than the tendency to rely primarily on armaments as the solution of the present crisis. Thoughtful citizens, as well as foreigners, are becoming increasingly apprehensive of the constant cry that we must be strong, that we must get "tough," that force is the only language Russia understands.

There is no doubt that the Truman Administration emphasized militarism and force. Its policy of containment was framed largely by George F. Kennan, who ends his interesting book, *American Diplomacy 1900-1950,* with the hope that through constant pressure in which armaments will play a part in terms of a threat, Russia can eventually be forced to be good. It must also be remembered that Truman himself was often imprudent in some of his statements of policy,[16] and that during his term of office and with his support a very determined effort was made to force universal military training upon an unwilling America. Neither must it be forgotten that it was America which produced the first atomic bombs and dropped them on the helpless people of two Japanese

cities to the horror of all Asians;[17] and thus began the greatest race and struggle for power in all the history of man.

Nor has the coming of the Republicans to the seat of authority helped matters; it has made a bad situation worse. The new President's background and experience are not political but almost altogether military.[18] Moreover, some of his policies have seriously shaken the confidence of our allies.[19] Again, while his speech of April 17, 1953 was in many ways excellent and offered a great hope to the world,[20] little or nothing has been done to implement it. Worse yet, in subsequent speeches the emphasis on military preparedness is again dominant.[21] Thus, the arms race continues since the Americans, like the Russians, hold an olive branch in one hand but a mighty sword in the other, to the dismay of mankind. Besides this, there are decidedly fascistic tendencies in the United States today: the liberal is hounded on every side by investigators, and the recent burning of books reminds one of the Middle Ages and the Inquisition. Thus, the greatest threat to America today as far as an internal threat is concerned is not Communism, but an American brand of fascism marching under the stars and stripes and mouthing the slogans of democracy.

In short, as one looks across the world today, the actual dominance of philosophies of power is appalling. It is most evident, of course, in the stupendous conflict between the two titans, each seeking to rally the rest of mankind under its banner. But the most frightening aspect is undoubtedly the arms race. First, there came the feverish race for the atomic bomb, soon followed by the fiendish struggle for that King of Terrors, perhaps the ultimate as far as brute power is concerned, the Hydrogen Bomb.

3. LIMITATIONS, DEFECTS, AND CONSEQUENCES

Nothing seems more real and effective than physical power, armed might, especially in terms of the new weapons which seem to utilize that which is ultimate in nature. In contrast, ideas, ideals, and moral and spiritual power seem to be very weak indeed; so weak, in fact, that it is easy to dismiss them, Freudian fashion, as illusions. Yet such superficial thinking cannot bear philosophical criticism. A moment of serious reflection will reveal the fallacy

of this and all types of materialism, no matter how refined or sophisticated.

After all, as the great philosophical idealists have always insisted, the so-called material forces are known only in terms of mind or ideas. Apart from ideas, they become utterly meaningless. Therefore, since all that is known, even the material, appears only in spiritual guise (that is, in terms of ideas which are not physical), it is reasonable to suppose that the universe is basically spiritual.[22]

Again, this point of view has been strengthened rather than weakened by the new energy theory of matter. Not only did this new theory shatter the old materialism, with its hard atoms, beyond hope of repair, but it also makes the explanation of matter itself in terms of mind or will appear more reasonable. Since matter is really energy and we know energy at first hand in terms of our own acts of willing, it is now easier to regard the whole universe as in some sense an expression of a Great Will, God. At the least, the new energy theory makes idealism more reasonable than ever before.[23]

Furthermore, wild restless energy is not necessarily in any sense ultimate in nature. For nature, even as Heraclitus recognized long ago, contains something besides mere change: it contains law; there is orderly change. Even the very atom has a pattern and an organization which it is difficult to break. Besides, nature manifests design and beauty on a vast scale; and it produces minds who cherish ideals. Nor are these ideals nearly as weak in the long run as they seem to be in the short run. Thus these facts, too often neglected by the materialist, seem to lead us in the direction of theism. More will be said about this in the third chapter.

It must also be pointed out that even from the common sense or purely practical side nothing is more evident than the weakness of blind power and brute strength without the control of idea, purpose. Without proper control by mind, sheer power becomes destructive. Power without reason or even with only a minimum of reason spells doom.

The tragedy of it all is that while some of the best minds have taken part in the discovery of atomic energy, it is often entrusted to those who are far less intelligent and ethically sensitive.[24] Any serious student of history knows that those who guide the destinies of nations are far too often of average or even less than average

intelligence. It must also be kept in mind that the time may come when any irresponsible dictator of any nation, no matter how small, may have atomic weapons.

In short, today as never before, ideas and ideals are far more important than sheer strength. For in the final analysis, these spiritual forces are still the arbiters of the destinies of men and of nations. Even as the smaller mammals with their larger brains and better minds survived while the huge dinosaurs with all their strength perished, so likewise in our day these great titans may perish while in the remote corners of the earth where they have fled for refuge a few idealists may survive to repeople the earth. At any rate, sheer power without creative ideas means catastrophe.

It may be contended, of course, that for ideas and high ethical ideals to become effective physical power is necessary as means. That there is a large amount of truth in this statement no one can deny. Only the most doctrinaire, absolute pacifist will insist that the use of force is always and everywhere evil and unnecessary.[25] Force, like the surgeon's scalpel, may sometimes be necessary. Yet it has only a limited function, especially in the highly complex modern world, and must be used as carefully as the surgeon uses his knife; that is, never until all other means have been exhausted, and never unless there is reasonable certainty that its use will not lead to greater evils.

It is becoming increasingly evident, however, that it has outlived its usefulness as an instrument of international policy; at least in the military sense. The stage has been reached where military weapons can no longer protect us but destroy in the very act of vainly trying to protect. The so-called Korean "police action" is the latest, as well as one of the best, examples. In the very act of attempting to "liberate," the hostile armies have turned it into a desert and into a bloody shamble.

Perhaps it is likewise well to show that the dangerous philosophies of power to which America and Russia are increasingly giving their devotion are contrary to the very best in both of their traditions. Unlike Nazism and Fascism, neither American democracy nor Russian Communism favors war and militarism or regards them as ends in themselves; both hate these evils and seek deliverance. Let it be repeated: at the basis of American democracy lies the highest

idealism; and *at its best* America has always stood for the value of the individual, freedom, justice in terms of fairness, and high religion.[26]

Similarly, at its best Russian Communism stands for economic justice, the rights of women, and racial equality.[27] It must also be remembered that the Russian people as a whole have always been and are still a very religious people, regardless of the policies of their rulers. But the tragic fact is that the present devotion of both nations to philosophies of power in their paranoic fear of one another is driving them toward Fascism, something which they both hate and tried to defeat.

It may also be contended from an entirely practical point of view that the present staggering cost of armaments will drive both the United States and Russia to bankruptcy. Nor can it be denied that these false philosophies are leading to what Toynbee has called "the intoxication of victory." [28] In other words, when a nation comes out of a war victorious it tends to become "power happy." For the strong man confident of his power proudly overreaches himself by offending and threatening another strong man so that the bitter end result is mutual destruction.

At any rate, the more one arms, the more the other arms; the tougher one gets, the tougher the other gets to save face both at home and abroad. The more one threatens and bullies, the more the other threatens and bullies. The net result is more fear and less and less security. Thus philosophies of sheer power end in sheer futility, as the present situation amply proves.

It is true, of course, that under certain circumstances a powerful nation may successfully threaten and overawe a much weaker nation, as Hitler did Austria and Czechoslovakia. However, this same strategy cannot be expected to work in the case of a strong antagonist like Russia. It is also certain that if we could not make Russia behave when we had a monopoly of the atomic and hydrogen bombs, and when she did not have China as her ally that we cannot make her behave through our threatenings now that she has all three. Nor can we hope to contain her without bleeding ourselves to death. In fact, it seems that in the present struggle both the Soviet Union and the United States are bleeding themselves to death if they only knew it.

Our conclusion then must be that philosophies of sheer might are philosophically unsound, and practically dangerous and hopelessly out of date. The apocalyptic weapons in which the two titans in the present world struggle put their trust can give no security.[29] Thus our great need is finding a philosophy and program of action, a strategy capable of giving us the security needed in order to realize our highest possibilities as human beings. With this need in mind we shall continue our quest.

NOTES

1 See *The Republic,* Book I. 337-340.

2 *Thus Spake Zarathustra* is Nietzsche's most popular book; it contains perhaps the clearest exposition of his thought.

3 For his influence on Hitler, see Heiden, *Der Fuehrer,* pp. 234-41.

4 Oswald Spengler, *Man and Technics* (trans. Charles Francis Atkinson), p. 28 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1932). Used by permission.

5 Oswald Spengler, *The Hour of Decision* (trans. Charles Francis Atkinson), p. 230 (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1934). Used by permission.

6 On Dialectical Materialism, see the following: "The Communist Manifesto," and excerpts from Lenin and Stalin in Chandler, *The Clash of Political Ideals,* pp. 158-205; also Somerville, *Soviet Philosophy,* and parts of *The Philosophy of Peace.* For criticisms consult, Bennett, *Christianity and Communism,* and this writer's *History and God,* pp. 29-33, 205-206.

7 See his excellent book, *A History of Philosophical Ideas in America,* pp. 575-76.

8 Metaphysics is that branch of philosophy which deals with ultimate causes, the ultimate nature of things.

9 See, for example, Dewey, *Human Nature and Conduct,* pp. 175-80.

10 One of the best presentations of naturalism by a group of distinguished naturalists is, of course, Krikorian (ed.), *Naturalism and the Human Spirit;* a more popular version is Krutch, *The Modern Temper;* one of the best criticisms is Brightman, *Nature and Values;* a good but more popular criticism is found in Nixon, *Responsible Christianity,* pp. 17-54.

11 For an interesting criticism of modern science and modern scientific education by a scientist, see Brown, "Of Science and Man," in Chase (ed.), *Years of the Modern,* pp. 207-29.

12 Popular magazines both reflect and stimulate modern man's fascination with power; see, for example, Davidson, "Our Wonder Weapons," *Collier's,* April 5, 1952, p. 15. The editors even go so far as to call these "peace weapons."

13 Former Secretary of State, James F. Byrnes, in his *Speaking Frankly,* p. 28, denies that Stalin made this statement; but he does insist that he acted on this principle.

14 See Carr, *Studies in Revolution,* pp. 220-23.

15 See the texts of the funeral orations over Stalin's body by Premier Malenkov, and Deputy Premier Beria, *The New York Times,* March 10, 1953, p. 10. The execution of a jobless West German truck driver by firing squad and the subsequent beating down of a worker's revolt in East Berlin certainly illustrate the power principle; see *The Detroit Free Press,* June 19, 1953, p. 1.

16 As, for example, concerning the possible use of the atomic bomb in Korea; see *The World Almanac 1952,* p. 203.

17 Reasonable terms would have brought surrender without use of the bomb; see Leighton, *Human Relations in a Changing World,* pp. 58-75.

18 This is evident from his book, *Crusade in Europe.*

19 See *The New York Times,* Feb. 9, 1953, p. 3.

20 For the text, see *The Detroit Free Press,* April 17, 1953, pp. 20-21.

21 See *ibid.,* May 8, 1953, p. 1, and also *The Christian Century,* Oct. 21, 1953, pp. 1187, 1191-92.

22 Some have insisted that ideas are purely physical, mere brain movements and nervous impulses; but this does not account for two striking facts: ideas have meaning, and to an amazing degree in terms of will are able to control brain movements and nervous impulses.

23 For the idealistic implications of the new science, see Jeans, *The Mysterious Universe,* pp. 137-88.

24 Some scientists are becoming so concerned about their responsibility that they refuse to give their services to atomic energy projects designed for military purposes.

25 This is no condemnation of pacifism; the world owes too much to the great practical pacifists, such as are found among the Friends, and also among the leaders and members of the Fellowship of Recon-

ciliation. They are in reality the trail blazers in man's greatest adventure: the search of a way to peace. The world needs more practical pacifists.

26 For the religious basis of American democracy, see Thomas, *This Nation Under God;* for a thought provoking account of the "tragic dilemma" in which America finds herself, see Niebuhr, *The Irony of American History.*

27 For Russian idealism as embodied in its Constitution, consult Chandler, *op. cit.,* pp. 200-205.

28 See his *War and Civilization,* pp. 104-11 for a graphic account of the results of militarism.

29 This will become more certain in the light of later discussion.

CHAPTER TWO

Other Dangerous Philosophies

The most dangerous philosophies, as far as the achievement of world peace is concerned, are the materialistic philosophies of power. Unless undermined by criticism and replaced by a more adequate and rational philosophy, they will certainly help to hurl mankind over Niagara. Yet these are by no means the only systems which stand in the way of peace. There are others which, though not necessarily warlike, still are obstructive; for they tend to block the impulse and to inhibit the necessary effort toward an enduring peace. These philosophies must now be examined.

1. FATALISTIC PHILOSOPHIES

Fatalism is an old thought system which has taken many forms. It has been closely associated with astrology and also with some types of religion. The basic idea is that there is no real freedom, contingency: every event is conceived as necessary, inevitable; blind Fate is ultimate. As far as modern philosophic fatalism is concerned, Oswald Spengler is the leading figure. He held that all human cultures, like individuals, go through the cycles of birth, infancy, youth, manhood, old age, and death. These stages are fixed, unchangeable; man is in the grip of Fate.[1] This view has many weaknesses which this writer has criticized elsewhere.[2]

Our chief concern here, however, is the relation of fatalism to war. It naturally takes the inevitability of war for granted. War is as natural and inevitable as the return of bad weather; there have always been wars and there will always be. Moreover, man is utterly helpless in the face of this catastrophe. Some have even defended this view on religious grounds: war is the result of Adam's sin, part of the curse and judgment which God has pro-

nounced upon a sinful world. Hence it is impossible to do anything about it—how dare puny man question or attempt to change the Eternal Decrees of God? Others make an empirical appeal to the facts of history: there have always been wars and all past efforts to outlaw war have failed miserably; in fact, in spite of all our frantic efforts, wars have steadily become worse. Therefore, it seems reasonable to suppose that conflicts will continue until the final catastrophe with which the cycle ends.

Most popular fatalism, of course, is based on ignorance and the unwillingness or the inability to think straight. Men do not know or have forgotten that once thinkers, including even the great Aristotle, believed that such a curse as slavery is perfectly natural.[3] There was a time when it was taken for granted that God ordained some men to be slaves, as He ordained others to rule. Similarly, not so long ago men contended that disease and poverty are inevitable, even quoting Scripture to prove their point. Yet by a combination of rational idealism and social and political action, an aroused humanity has virtually eliminated chattel slavery, and disease and poverty may go next. In fact, unless man stumbles into war and his society disintegrates, there is little or no danger of a recurrence of plagues such as the Black Death.

Again, it is fallacious to contend that, since war always has been, it will always be. It is in no sense the inevitable result of a natural or a Divine Law. Rather, it arises out of human relationships; and now that we know the basic causes it is possible to deal with them effectively if we are willing to pay the price in terms of necessary thought and effective action. As long as the causes of a disease are unknown, it is indeed inevitable; but once these are known the search for the remedy begins, and when this is found all that is necessary is application.[4]

Nor are man's past failures, of necessity, the sign of future failure and ultimate despair. It took many failures before chattel slavery was at long last abolished, and any student of medicine knows that the same applies to plagues. Yet from each failure something was gained in terms of knowledge which made final victory and triumph possible. Let us take courage to believe the same is true of the curse of war. For, as will be shown later, across the ages the peace movement has gained increasing momentum; and today war stands

condemned as never before in the white light of man's developing moral consciousness. It is not too much to hold with Immanuel Kant that the continued development of man's higher capacities will finally doom war;[5] that is, unless man in an insane moment takes the last fatal step.

Finally, to call war the Will of God is nothing short of sheer blasphemy. If war is God's Will, then God is a monstrous Devil and it would be more worthy of human dignity to repudiate Him than to fall before Him slavishly. Better a thousand times to defy arbitrary, irresponsible authority with Prometheus than to become a fawning puppet. Yet it must be remembered that the very best representatives of religion from Confucius, Mo-ti, and the Buddha to the greatest of the Prophets of Israel and Jesus of Nazareth have been on the side of peace.[6] If these are the best expressions and manifestations of the Divine Will made visible, as they must be, then the Power behind the universe opposes war as a curse to be eliminated through continued and persistent struggle with Necessity.

It is indeed deplorable that Christians, through a kind of religious fatalism, have often become the tools of reaction and totalitarianism. No one less than the great St. Augustine himself, in spite of his hankerings after predestination, long ago made it clear that Christianity is incompatible with fatalism;[7] and the same, of course, applies equally to Judaism. The message of high religion is that man must not be a cringing slave to his environment but that he must master and conquer it in order to realize his high destiny.[8]

At any rate, if we are to have peace it is high time that all religions, including Islam, rid themselves of fatalism and harness the power and dynamics of religious conviction to the achievement of an enduring peace as the Will of God for our tragic times. One thing is certain: as long as men are content to grovel in the treacherous quicksands of fatalism, the very calamities which they ignorantly believe inevitable will indeed become inevitable, not as the result of blind Fate but by their very inaction. Man can only be free and expect the assistance of the Cosmic Power as he acts like a free being by rising up and girding his loins, and struggling manfully with evil.

2. ESCAPIST PHILOSOPHIES

During times of crisis such as ours many seek a way of escape from their fears and responsibilities rather than face them with the intention of mastery. The author is reminded of the student who told him quite frankly that students, along with others, do not want to hear about the dangers of an atomic war since it is too disturbing. The answer was that if people try to escape from their problems while it is still possible to do something about them, some day they may awake to discover in horror that stark catastrophe is on its way, hurricane-winged, and that nothing can be done to stop it.

(1) *Apocalypticism*

There are two kinds of escapists who are prominent today. The first seek to escape the duty of effective action. Among them are many religious sentimentalists and pseudo-mystics. This writer has great respect for the practical mystics such as Gandhi and such as are to be found in the Society of Friends. The world has never had enough of them; and to them we must look for the dynamics so necessary for an aggressive peace movement. However, there are others who seek an easy escape in the mush of religious sentimentalism and the fantasies and delusions of a false mysticism. They seek refuge in these as others seek it in drugs and alcohol. If religion ever needed a clear head as well as a warm heart, this is the hour.

The most influential type of escapism is apocalypticism. To begin with, there is the more or less sophisticated apocalypticism of Karl Barth and his followers. For Barth himself as a man, especially in his courageous stand against the tyranny of Hitler, one cannot have anything but admiration. Again, as a wholesome reaction against the religious and philosophical humanism which practically whittles God down to an aspect of man and his values, and as a protest against a shallow, fussy concern for social action, there is much to be said for his system. Yet in his almost total rejection of reason in theology, in his low estimate of man as over against the transcendent God, in his dogmatism, and in his reversion to a certain type of apocalypticism and his consequent tendency to belittle social action, his view is decidedly inadequate for

these times and even obstructive. It has certainly served to hinder European and even American churches as sources of a dynamic movement against war.[9]

But far more discouraging are America's own and often bizarre forms of apocalypticism. The appeal of apocalyptic evangelists such as Billy Graham and the mushroom growth of cults indicate the widespread influence of this movement, archaic as it may seem in the twentieth century.[10] Insofar as it expresses a genuine religious longing, this writer has no quarrel with it; but the extent to which it so often obstructs the demands of high religion, and especially the concern for world peace, is to be deplored.

The author has witnessed the obstructive effects of popular apocalypticism. Once after he had concluded an address calling for effective peace action, the pious chairman arose and asked if, after all, it was not best to leave the whole matter to God; that the most poor mortals can do for peace is to pray for it. Worse yet, when a group composed of educators, ministers, and a greatly concerned physicist offered their services freely as speakers to awaken the public to the dangers of an atomic holocaust, the response of the clergy was most discouraging. Of the some three hundred contacted, only about a dozen showed a real interest. Later, when a second attempt was made, the response was not much better, with the result that the peace endeavor all but failed.

Why, then, were these men who are supposed to be shepherds of the sheep ever alert to the approach of the wolf, so unconcerned? Some undoubtedly did not respond because of fear; for so great is the popular hysteria in certain places that any advocate of peace and sound reason is in danger of being labeled. This, however, was not the chief reason why so few of these men responded. For it was discovered later most of them probably did not respond due to their apocalyptic tendencies. "Why worry about an atomic war? These are but signs that Jesus is coming soon. Why waste our puny efforts? Only he by his visible appearance can bring peace to our poor, sin cursed world."

Needless to say, as long as large numbers of its members are motivated by these thought patterns, the Church is greatly hindered in its quest for peace. What is needed is a more rational and effective philosophy which appeals to the head, as well as to the heart

and the imagination. The Church needs a better system of education to enlighten its people concerning the meaning and the demands of high religion. More than this, it needs to show a greater concern for the masses who work with their hands, lest they drift to the cults; perhaps more chaplains to labor groups would greatly help.

(2) *Positivism*

The second type of escapists are the positivists: those philosophers who try to avoid the responsibility of hard thinking about ultimates, the deeper meaning of the universe and of human life, and the possibility of the existence of God. Aside from that modern type known as Logical Positivists who tend to lose themselves amid the subtleties and complexities of logic and semantics, positivists as a rule do not shirk social responsibilities.[11] Indeed many, including Auguste Comte, the father of modern positivism, have been greatly concerned with social problems; more than this, some of them have made outstanding contributions to world peace.

Yet, as will be shown presently, if this world crisis is to be met adequately, social action without an adequate sustaining philosophy is not enough. Too many social actionists lack depth. This is certainly the chief fault of all positivists: they vainly try to toss aside lightly the search for absolutes, including God and Cosmic Purpose. In fact, most of them, like the naturalists, seem to take it for granted that purposes deeper than human do not exist except as mere figments of the imagination:

> Whenever there comes a philosopher who tells you that he has found the ultimate truth, do not trust him. If he tells you that he knows the ultimate good, or has a proof that the good must become reality, do not trust him, either. The man merely repeats the errors which his predecessors have committed for two thousand years. It is time to put an end to this brand of philosophy. Ask the philosopher to be as modest as the scientist; then he may become as successful as the man of science. But do not ask him what you should do. Open your ears to your own will, and try to unite your will with that of others. There is no more purpose or meaning in the world than you put into it.[12]

This statement is more or less typical of certain popular positivists; but it will not bear criticism. To begin with, as a protest against theological and philosophical dogmatism, it has some relevance. However, the writer fails to distinguish between every philosopher's conceptions which are never absolute in the full sense of the word and the basic conviction which lies at the basis of both philosophy and science that there really must be truth, which is something more than our inadequate human notions. To deny the existence of truth which is objective and absolute would undermine all science, since it would make the expert's opinion no better than that of the man on the street; for it is the claim of having found more truth or at least a more exact conception or approximation that makes the former's ideas in his special field at least far superior to the latter's.

It will also be seen that Reichenbach lightly dismisses the testimony of the vast majority of the greatest thinkers of the ages as erroneous in favor of his own, which he holds to be true. Here he seems hardly as modest as he professes to be. More than that, with insufficient proof he asserts rather pontifically that there is no purpose or meaning in the universe except what man puts into it.[13] If belief is dogmatic at times, so is unbelief.

Moreover, he rather naively holds that science has been very successful as over against philosophy. It might be well to ask in what sense it has been successful. While it has greatly benefited man in enlarging his control over nature, it can give no light on the ethical problem as to the ends for which this vast power should be used. Consequently, unless we can get the much needed light from higher sources, science may doom us and our kind. At any rate, it is high time to bring the devotees of the cult of science to their senses by tearing the veil of illusion from their idol. This rather blind devotion to science is just as bad and perhaps in the bitter end even worse than the blind, unreasoning rejection of science by religious obscurantists.[14]

Finally, the statement, "Open your ears to your own will, and try to unite your will with that of others," is certainly vague. In fact, it is flippant and really smacks of irrationalism. Is the writer trying to tell us to merely follow our own impulses and to join them with those of others without the rational and ethical guidance

afforded by the larger and broader and deeper experience of the human race? That would add to our confusion; it would mean chaos. For if we ever needed to be rational in the very highest sense of the word, this is the time and this is the hour. Impulse and unreason will lead to the abyss.

All positivists, of course, would not go as far as the philosopher who has been criticized. Yet all are agreed that it is futile to search for God and ultimates.[15] As a result, in the final analysis, many of them are not far from naturalism and even materialism. Thus, like the latter, their effect on the public leads to an undue emphasis on the physical, especially the achievements of the sciences, at the expense of the moral and the spiritual. Moreover, in denying any kind of deeper purpose in life and the universe, positivism empties human life of ultimate meaning and significance, causing untold numbers to believe that it is fundamentally meaningless and futile. In other words, the man who takes positivism and naturalism seriously finds himself in a vast cosmic drift, alone on a great dark ocean headed toward no shore.

A great psychiatrist has said that all of his patients over thirty-five years of age are suffering from one basic cause: the lack of a real sense of meaning in life.[16] In other words, when men no longer find any deeper meaning or purpose in life, especially when confronting crises, they tend to become neurotic; and this same great psychiatrist has also pointed out that the natural calamities are not the sources of the most serious dangers, but rather the psychical.[17] This is certainly true when one ponders the character and career of Adolf Hitler, as pictured so graphically by Konrad Heiden.[18]

If there ever was a neurotic, Hitler certainly was one: he was nervous, restless, blustering, unsure of himself, barbarous, untidy, unhappy, frenzied upon occasion, egotistical (possessed with monstrous visions of grandeur), beastly cruel, and in the bitter end unsuccessful in everything he ever attempted, including the war. What was Hitler's basic trouble? His basic trouble was frustration due to a rather empty, trivial life that lacked the dynamic to do honest work; and even more basic was his inability to find any real meaning in life since he had no faith in God. Yet man cannot live long without some thread of purpose in terms of devotion to some-

thing. So into this great emptiness in this Austrian's life, enthusiasm for Germany poured and a misanthropic glorification of war. In fact, for him Germany literally became God and he the prophet of this new twentieth century paganism.[19] Heiden closes his remarkable book with these words:

> *Hitler was able to enslave his own people because he seemed to give them something that even the traditional religions could no longer provide; the belief in a meaning to existence beyond the narrowest self-interest. The real degradation began when people realized that they were in league with the Devil, but felt that even the Devil was preferable to the emptiness of an existence which lacked a larger significance. The problem today is to give that larger significance and dignity to a life that has been dwarfed by the world of material things. Until that problem is solved, the annihilation of Naziism will be no more than the removal of one symptom of the world's unrest.*[20]

This is a passage which every philosopher who lightly dismisses the search for Ultimates could well ponder; for without them there is no real basis for belief in the dignity of personality.

3. RELATIVISTIC PHILOSOPHIES

Closely related to naturalists and positivists is the large tribe of relativists. Many historians, economists, and perhaps even more sociologists belong to this group.[21] Moreover, among the philosophers there are many who share this general point of view. The basis of relativism is the idea that there is nothing fixed or absolute: truth, as well as ideals of right and wrong, are relative to the particular culture, age, nation, class to which the individual belongs, or even to the desires and tastes of the individual himself. We quote again from Reichenbach, since he so well exemplifies the type which is prominent today:

> The ethical axioms are not necessary truths because they are not truths of any kind. . . . What then is an imperative? An imperative is a linguistic utterance which we use with the intention of influencing another person, of making the other person do something we want to be done, or not to do something we want not to be done. . . . The attempts of philosophers to fashion ethics as a system of knowledge has broken down.

> The moral systems thus constructed were nothing but reproductions of the ethics of certain sociological groups; of Greek bourgeois society, of the Catholic Church, of the Middle Class of the preindustrial age, of the age of industry and the proletarian. . . . The universe follows the laws of physics, not moral commands. . . . Scientific philosophy has abandoned completely the plan of advancing moral rules. . . . The fundamental ethical rules are not justifiable through knowledge, but are adhered to merely because human beings want these rules and want other persons to follow the same rules.[22]

Ethical relativism as here represented contains many half-truths and fallacies. First of all, like most relativists, Reichenbach fails to distinguish between moral rules or laws or systems as formulated at any one time and the moral ideal. It will readily be granted by absolutists that all such codes are largely relative; but what will not be granted is that the moral ideal is likewise relative. Nearly all the greatest philosophers and religious leaders have been moral absolutists and have protested vigorously against relativism. Moreover, similar to other relativists, Reichenbach fails to realize how much agreement there has been among the very greatest teachers of mankind, representing very diverse cultures, concerning such basic ideals as self-discipline, justice, integrity, and the Golden Rule.[23] In fact, like many modern thinkers, in his eagerness to reduce all knowledge to that which can be proven in the strict scientific sense, he seems to have little respect for the wisdom of the ages.

Worse yet, after having made the attempt to strip moral imperatives of their absoluteness, he tries behavioristic fashion to reduce them to nothing but "linguistic" utterances, to the mores of various conflicting groups, and finally to functions of will and desire. This makes them so utterly relative and subjective that they will appear of little or no significance. Consequently, they will command no respect; no one will follow them unless it is to his own selfish interest or to the interest of his group. The end result would be that not right but selfishness backed by power would determine all important issues. In the final analysis, this means totalitarianism: the individual or group with the most power would not

only rule but seek to impose its will by stamping out all minority groups—might would be right.

The fact that, taken seriously, relativism means the lack of all moral directives, sheer moral anarchism, the result of the confusing struggle and clash of wills, cannot be stressed too much. There are ominous signs that we are fast approaching such a state of affairs in America. One is the amoral attitude which so many scientists, even including specialists in the field, are showing toward the very important subject of sex. To listen to some of these so-called experts, one would think they regard anything and everything permissible; and that desire and pleasure are the only guides. Again, politics are disgustingly rotten since the selfish aims of individuals and groups, not ethical absolutes, constitute the determining factors. The same applies to the relations of business and labor.

Most dangerous of all, moral principles have little place in our foreign policy. As has already been shown, much of it rests almost entirely on the philosophy of naked power which is amoral. Nor is the American public ethically alert and sensitive: aside from certain groups, it actually condoned the dropping of atom bombs on defenseless cities without any great concern. Unless we change our ways and recognize the importance of ethics and demand a greater concern for other people, they will one day band against us in wrath and destroy us with even less concern.

It must be said in fairness to Reichenbach that he does not favor pure individualism and the resulting anarchism. He tries to mend his fences by an appeal to democratic process: right action does not spring from allegiance to absolute ideals but it comes through the give and take of group discussion, criticism, and action whereby excessive individualism is checked and creative solutions to problems are discovered and executed.[24] But here he becomes entangled in a whole nest of difficulties.

To begin with, democracy cannot be taken for granted; it has many enemies, and today it is decidedly on the defensive in much of the world. Nor does democratic procedure alone guarantee that the right will prevail. Democracies are sometimes corrupt and this tendency cannot always be corrected by group action. There is such a thing as the tyranny of the majority. And it may be well to ask: if there are really no absolute standards of right and wrong

which are more and above mere group desire, to what norm can the injured minority appeal? If, however, the group recognizes certain common ideals as absolute and binding, then by showing how majority action has been inconsistent with these norms, the minority can make an appeal that may in the end cause the majority to reverse its action. Thus, in opposing the present tragic tendency toward fascism, the best weapon in the hands of liberals is to make the American public aware of the fact that this trend is contrary to its own professed standards; and the same applies to present militaristic inclinations.

Reichenbach, of course, insists that the absolutist is too rigid and thus finds it difficult to adjust himself to the demands of a democratic society.[25] This is no doubt true of the uncompromising dogmatic types which will be considered later. What he fails to consider, however, is that if the Founding Fathers of the American Republic had not believed in certain absolutes, they could not have stood up successfully against tyranny. In other words, democracy in America and elsewhere came to birth largely because there were determined minorities who believed in a standard of right far beyond the ken of the tyrant in power. Consistent relativists would never have established a single democracy. Nor do most relativists seriously consider the fact that belief in an absolute, however inadequate and even bad their particular variety may be, gives Communists their terrific driving power and propaganda appeal; believing as they do that they are in harmony with the very nature of things. Therefore, any country that flippantly revels in relativism will collapse before it like a deck of cards.

Finally, when all is said and done, insofar as Reichenbach really takes democracy seriously, he sets up his absolute. For it cannot be denied that democracy is not only a political creed but also implies a philosophy based upon the absoluteness of ideals such as freedom, justice, and the sacredness of personality. Incidentally, these have come to us chiefly as the products of high religion. Thus, in accepting democracy he seems to find his absolute and overthrows his own relativism. Of course, he sees this and admits (as he must to save his own position) that even democracy is relative; that is, there is nothing universal and obligatory about it in the sense of being the ideal toward which all nations and societies

should move.[26] In fact, perhaps the greatest weakness of all relativisms is that they give us no pattern of what ought to be, no signposts indicating in which direction we ought to be moving. Hence, they are bankrupt.

Moreover, our most serious charges against these thinkers stand. Since they believe in no absolutes, norms, or standards which have any universal application, when pressed they must admit that, strictly speaking, in terms of their theory, Nazism is as good and true as democracy. If it is all in the final analysis really a matter of will and desire, the net result can only be that the will and desire of the stronger individual or group will prevail; that might makes right beyond which there is no appeal to a higher norm, ideal, or standard. Can it be doubted, then, that relativism, along with dark fatalism and the various forms of escapism, is obstructive to peace?[27]

4. DOGMATIC ABSOLUTISM

Having escaped the treacherous quicksands of relativism, there is always the danger of taking to the bogs of some form of dogmatic, authoritarian absolutism. In fact, the latter is in accord with a basic tendency and need of human nature, the desire for security. It is also in accord with the mind's search for something unchanging which has inspired so much philosophic quest, and with the ego's concern for superiority.

As relativism leads directly to confusion, chaos, and anarchy, thus paving the way for a final totalitarianism, so dogmatic absolutism leads directly to totalitarianism. For there is always the tendency to interpret the absolute ideal in terms of the mores of one's own society, nation, or group. Even the great philosopher Hegel was not altogether free from this tendency. Hence, he has been accused (though unfairly) of identifying the goal of history with the Prussian state.[28] At any rate, once a man gets the idea of possessing the absolute good and the absolute truth, it is easy for him to convince himself that he must impose it on others for their good. No one can doubt that this has been the source of much imperialism, such as the conception of "the white man's burden."

Dogmatic, authoritarian absolutism has threatened man from the very dawn of civilization, since it tends to turn some aspect of his

culture into an infallible absolute which none dare question and before which all must bow. Historically, it has been associated primarily with religion and politics.

Religiously speaking, it has taken the form of the infallible church, the infallible book, and the infallible leader. The inevitable result has been the hallowing not only of the great insights of the past but also the obstruction of progress through the hallowing of the errors and shortcomings and the evils of the past. Thus, slavery and even war itself have been defended on Biblical grounds. In other words, the attempt has been made and is still being made to impose the mores of primitive Hebrew society on the twentieth century with disastrous results.

Though religious authoritarianism is still with us, yet it is not nearly so dangerous as the political in terms of fascism and other forms of totalitarianism. In fact, these totalitarian systems are merely the dangerous philosophies of physical power viewed from another aspect. Consequently, we can afford to be brief.

The basic idea is that the glorified state and its leader or leaders are ultimate; that is, they function as absolutes. This idea is by no means new; it was certainly evident in ancient Egypt, in the Roman Empire during its latter days, and in Japan. Often, too, the religious is mingled with the political, the leaders of the state assuming some or all of the attributes of deity. This was certainly true in the case of the three countries mentioned.

As far as modern types are concerned, Hitler and Mussolini naturally come to mind with their emphasis on the state and their glorification of war. But it has already become evident that there are similar tendencies today, not only in Soviet Russia but even in democratic America. In the latter the professional veteran and patriotic groups are often especially guilty; for not only is there at times a dangerous warlike attitude but there is also the tendency to restrict freedom and to glorify America to the point of being virtually infallible, blameless, and altogether above criticism. In foreign eyes this looks like fascism and has cost us many a friend.

There are two chief protections against fascism. The first is the spirit of rational criticism which tends to induce a spirit of humility. Though there are undoubtedly absolutes, it must be remembered that our human conceptions are always more or less relative;

and to endow the relative and partial with the attribute of absoluteness is to create a monstrous idol. The second protection is to remove the conditions, such as poverty, which breed fascism.[29]

Thus far our task has been largely destructive. In this and the preceding chapter, it was necessary to approach the problem of a philosophy of peace by means of drastic criticisms of the systems obstructive to the realization of the vision of a warless world. The even more important task of a positive philosophy awaits us in the next chapter.

NOTES

1 See Spengler, *The Decline of the West,* Vol. I, pp. 31, 107, 118.

2 In *History and God,* pp. 33-40, 206-209.

3 See Aristotle, *Politics,* Book I, Ch. 4, 1254, in McKeon, *The Basic Works of Aristotle,* pp. 1131-33.

4 For the basic causes of war, see Ch. V, pp. 97-116.

5 See his little book, *Perpetual Peace,* pp. 31-35.

6 For the development of the peace movement, see pp. 121-25.

7 Augustine, *The City of God,* Book V, Ch. I, p. 215.

8 See Genesis 1:26-28; and Psalm 8.

9 For Barth's general position his *Dogmatics in Outline* serves well; for his apocalypticism, see "There Shall Be Signs" in Barth & Thurneysen, *God's Search for Man,* pp. 143-57; for a brilliant criticism of Barth's general position, consult, DeWolf, *The Religious Revolt Against Reason.*

10 If Graham would overhaul his theology and harness his strong conviction to the drive against war he could do much good. His recent stand against racial discrimination may be a hopeful sign. For Graham's apocalypticism, see his *Peace with God,* pp. 203-16.

11 For two brief but excellent discussions of Logical Positivism, see Bergmann, "Logical Positivism" in Ferm (ed.), *A History of Philosophical Systems,* pp. 471-82; and Feigl, "Logical Empiricism" in Runes (ed.), *Twentieth Century Philosophy,* pp. 373-416.

12 Hans Reichenbach, *The Rise of Scientific Philosophy,* p. 302. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1951). Used by permission.

13 He does give some consideration to the signs of purpose in the universe but hardly profoundly; see pp. 196-214.

14 On the part science played in the ruin of Germany, see Lilge, *The Abuse of Learning,* especially Ch. III, "The Idolatry of Science," pp. 57-83.

15 In this sense John Dewey was a positivist; see his *Quest for Certainty*; modern positivism and naturalism are very closely related.

16 C. G. Jung as quoted by Hocking, *Thoughts on Death and Life,* pp. 167-68.

17 Jung, *Psychology and Religion,* pp. 11-12.

18 See *Der Fuehrer,* especially pp. 74-76, 84-85, 356-89.

19 Heiden, *op. cit.,* p. 758.

20 Konrad Heiden, *Der Fuehrer* (trans. Ralph Manheim), pp. 773-74 (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1944). Used by permission.

21 By no means all historians, economists, and sociologists are relativists; for a protest by a historian, see Harrison, *This Age of Global Strife,* pp. vii-viii; and for a refutation by a sociologist, see Sorokin, *The Crisis of Our Age.*

22 Hans Reichenbach, *The Rise of Scientific Philosophy,* pp. 280, 281, 287, 302, 304. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1951). Used by permission.

23 For interesting illustrations of this fact, see "Appendix" in Lewis, *The Abolition of Man,* pp. 51-61.

24 Reichenbach, *op. cit.,* pp. 296-97.

25 Reichenbach, *op. cit.,* p. 300.

26 Reichenbach, *op. cit.,* p. 296.

27 For the part which various philosophical influences, some of them related to these systems, played in the descent of Germany to totalitarianism, see Lilge, *op. cit.,* pp. 111-30. For an excellent statement of the dangers of philosophies of power and relativism, see Trueblood, *The Predicament of Modern Man,* especially pp. 27-66. Though written before the close of the Second World War, it is even more revelant now. In fact, it is nothing short of prophetic of certain tragic tendencies of our time.

28 See, for example, Eddy, *God in History,* p. 112. Hegel believed that freedom is the goal of history and that it finds its highest embodiment in the Protestant nations; see his *Philosophy of History,* pp. 412-57.

29 This writer has a book in preparation which attempts to deal more adequately with this significant problem.

CHAPTER THREE

Essentials of a Philosophy

Destruction is always far easier than construction. Indeed, realizing the difficulty of presenting even the bare outlines of an adequate philosophy of peace, this writer approaches the task with sincere humility. It is too great for any mortal since it concerns the Ultimate Mystery which is always to some extent veiled.

Yet at the same time our human predicament is so desperate that everyone who thinks he sees even a glimmer of light is under obligation to share it with his fellows. Besides, there is at least one real consolation: the realization that one does not have to build up from the foundations to the superstructure, and that he need not labor alone. The foundations were laid long ago, and one has at his beck and call the creative insights of the greatest thinkers, teachers, and prophets of all times, all civilizations, and of all nations.

Moreover, in a book such as this, in which the aim is chiefly practical, our task cannot and need not be so ambitious as to demand the development of a complete system of philosophy. The most that need be attempted is a brief statement of the general principles underlying such a system. It will also become clear that high religion and philosophy are very closely related. Not only is high religion reasonable in the highest sense of the word, but reason in terms of philosophy is also religious. Anyone who has read Plato and Hegel knows that as the thinker reaches beyond the crude objects of the senses by means of the synoptic vision that the resulting insight becomes transfigured with profound religious significance.

One other thing must be said by way of introduction: mere criticism is not the best way to cure anyone who has been enthralled by a bad philosophy. Like the man in the Master's

saying, whose devil had been cast out, it may leave him so empty that seven devils more evil than the first will find a welcome there. To rid men of bad philosophies, they must be confronted by one that is better. This does not mean that the writer or anyone else can boast of having found the perfect system. It simply means what all would grant except extreme relativists: that some philosophies are better, nearer the truth, and from a pragmatic standpoint more elevating and constructive. The purpose of this chapter is to aim at presenting the outlines of such a philosophy.

1. UNIVERSALITY AND COMPREHENSIVENESS

Any philosophy which is to challenge mankind today must be universal and comprehensive. Later in searching for the causes of war, it will be found that one of the most prevalent, as well as pernicious of the political causes of war, selfish nationalism, and most of the ideological, spring from man's lack of vision—from his narrow parochial outlook. As in the old days all the gods went to war with their tribes, so in our day the various national deities and their ideologies are present on every battlefield.

Now there can be no doubt that religion, that is, all the great religious systems, have something to offer toward peace. It will be seen later how the peace movement originated with high religion and has always been closely associated with it. Still the various religions have so many narrow, nationalistic, particularistic, parochial elements clinging to their skirts that alone and unaided, they cannot find the way toward the real universality and comprehensiveness demanded by an emerging world civilization.[1] Besides this, they have often been in conflict, and the scars in terms of suspicion, fear, and prejudice, alas, are still with us. When even the various sects within such great systems as Christianity and Buddhism carry on private quarrels of their own, it is difficult to see how religion alone can lead the way toward world unity. Within Christianity itself there is even one great denomination which stubbornly refuses to recognize the others and seeks unity by attempting to swallow them.

In this dilemma philosophy may well lend a hand as it has done so often before.[2] For even though it, too, has its schools and sects

and cults, yet by its very nature it is freer from the restraints of dogma and authoritarianism than religion. After all, its last court of appeal is reason; and reason is the most universal principle known to man. Thus, above the din and confusion of schools and sects, philosophy's appeal can only be to the common truth as seen in its synoptic vision. For, like science, it cannot exist without this belief in truth—a truth which transcends nations, religions, and cultures. It was this belief in reason and truth which led the Stoics to conceive the universe as one vast commonwealth of reason under God;[3] and their influence helped to make way for the triumph of the dynamic universalism of Christianity.

If philosophy in our day will give up her preoccupation with trifles and, as in the great classic periods, rise to her high mission of pointing men toward reason, truth, and sanity, it might be surprising how many allies she would find, including no doubt the more sensitive scientists on the one hand and the vision and power of religion on the other. Their combined onslaught might overthrow many idols and thus hasten man's return to sanity. Among these idols would be the monstrous lies which breed wars, racialism, the false philosophies of power, and the totalitarian state.

However, such universality and comprehensiveness, though in harmony with the forces of history as they drive relentlessly toward world community, are difficult to apply. Application will require both real objectivity devoid of prejudice, and endless patience. The West must look for the truth and values hidden beneath the rather strange and grotesque garb which the religions of the East often wear. Likewise, we of the West must be objective enough to recognize the truth in Communism with the hope that the Communists themselves will become less paranoiac and dogmatic in their blusterings.

The least that philosophy, as the mother of the highest reason, can do in a world of irrationalities which are ever threatening to hurl it over the precipice, is to plant a standard to which all rational men of good will of all nations can repair during these dark days. Much of this kind of influence might well be centered in the United Nations where the nations of the world still meet in intelligent deliberations in spite of wars and rumors of wars.

2. THE ABSOLUTENESS OF TRUTH AND THE MORAL LAW

Next to the materialistic philosophies of power and the very closely related fascistic systems, relativism is perhaps the most dangerous philosophy; for it has become clear that in its denial of absolutes it leads to anarchy, chaos, nihilism, and as the need for order becomes manifest the ultimate result can only be some form of fascism. A philosophy adequate for this time of crisis when the very foundations seem to be shaking must magnify the objectivity and majesty of truth. Once men lose sight of truth as an objective factor rising above all opinions, creeds, and interests, they find themselves hopelessly drifting without a common standard of reference by which to evaluate situations and conflicting claims. Without such a standard the clash of interests ending in the dominance of the stronger becomes inevitable. Thus a decent international order becomes impossible; it vanishes in the Cimmerian darkness of relativism.

It is certain that Russia has not always been truthful in her actions in the United Nations; some would say she has been untruthful to the point of stupidity on some occasions. Yet who would be so bold as to say our own skirts are clean? For while on the one hand we shout the praises of democracy and are doing our best to check certain forms of totalitarianism, on the other we support Franco and almost every corrupt fascist and imperialist regime upon earth. Is there any wonder that we are fast becoming one of the most hated nations?

At any rate, as far as the foundations of a philosophy of peace are concerned, truth must be recognized as the final authority, the last court of appeal. Most traditions, sacred books, institutions, and creeds have their place and value but their real worth can only be seen in the light of the truth which they contain. This insistence on the absoluteness of truth need not, however, mean authoritarianism in another form. For along with it must go the conviction that our human conceptions are always more or less faulty and relative.[4] When in a dogmatic mood it is always well not to forget Cromwell's injunction: "By the bowels of Christ, I beseech you brethren to remember that you may be mistaken." To approach even to the gate of the palace of truth

one must pay the price of constant observation, reflection, and intelligent action.[5] Moreover, hasty, unreflective words and deeds are nowhere more disastrous than in international affairs.

Along with truth, the absoluteness of the moral law must be emphasized. This view finds support in the precepts of all the very greatest teachers of mankind. It is implicit in Buddha's conception of the Law of Karma and in his emphasis on universal love. The same is evident in Confucius' belief in the will of Heaven which constituted the dynamic back of his sense of mission, and in the Stoic concept of natural law, the law of reason which they conceived as a fundamental aspect of the universe and hence absolute. It is clearest of all in the great Hebrew Prophets and in Christianity where it is conceived as the Will of a just and righteous God; and failure to obey sooner or later brings judgment.

This belief in the absoluteness of the moral law also owes much to Socrates and Plato, it is evident in medieval thinkers such as St. Thomas Aquinas, and in modern philosophers such as Kant, Hegel, the neo-Thomists, and the Personalists. Three of the most significant arguments used in its defense may be briefly stated as follows: first, it is grounded in the very nature of things since man with his moral capacities seems to be the most important product and aspect of the universe; second, the appeal to history—in the long run at least judgment does seem to fall on the nations who become amoral and immoral, judgment in terms of social disintegration and destruction;[6] and third, the appeal to evolution—not only do man's ethical conceptions develop but as the process proceeds the moral and spiritual aspects of man seem to constitute the very end and goal of the whole venture. This view has been most brilliantly presented in recent times by the scientist, Lecomte du Noüy.[7]

How would sincere devotion to the absoluteness of the moral law affect international relations? To begin with, it would tend to make them less Machiavellian. The selfish, unprincipled struggle for power would be tempered by moral considerations in two vital respects: nations would be more scrupulous in keeping their pledged word; and they would be far less likely to indulge in vicious slander and propaganda. Insofar as these are causes of

war, and insofar as absolutism would remove them or at least reduce them, it could be a decided influence for peace.

Again, this same conviction would serve to undergird the realization of justice. In some ways the latter is the greatest and most basic of all the social virtues. Where it is lacking or where it fails the social order is bound to decay and usually revolution is just around the corner. Today international relations is little more than a vast amoral jungle in which might still seems to make right. If it is ever to be reformed it will be done largely by beginning, as we are trying to do (but far too weakly), through the dispensation of justice by means of the United Nations. Yet before this great international body can be an effective means, it must be given more adequate financial support. As long as astronomical sums are spent on armaments and the United Nations is given a miserable pittance, it cannot be blamed for not meeting all of our expectations.[8]

As a matter of fact, both Russia and the West tend to look upon justice as in some sense absolute. Though from a theoretical standpoint, the Marxians seem at times to deny all absolutes, still in their propaganda and to some extent in their practice so great is the emphasis on the realization of justice that it tends to become a functional absolute. It must be made clear, however, that there is a marked difference between the Russian and the Anglo-Saxon conceptions of justice. The former interprets it primarily in terms of the social responsibility to provide regular employment, while the latter thinks of justice almost entirely in terms of freedom and the legal rights of the individual. No doubt both conceptions embody truth:

> Anglo-Saxons, in striving to assert individual freedom, seem to have sacrificed social integrity and group unity. The Russians, in maintaining their collectivist economy under a dictatorship, have seemed to us to have submerged the individual in the mass, in a collectivist system to which the free Anglo-Saxon would never give his consent. . . . It may be that these two social orders of capitalism and collective socialism represent opposite halfs of truth, but that real truth lies only in its wholeness. And this truth may not be realized by two blocs, an Eastern and a Western, mutually suspicious and both arming in

self-defense, but in the effort to build one world in common loyalty to the United Nations.[9]

3. A CENTRAL HUMANISM AND PERSONALISM

Any philosophy adequate for these times must be empirical, that is, it must begin with the facts of experience rather than with some presupposed principle or doctrine such as belief in God. Eventually, of course, in the light of the basic facts, it may arrive at the idea of Cosmic Purpose and God; but it cannot begin there without being guilty of assuming what is to be proved. Thus it is better to begin with man, since he is both the subject of experience as thinker and actor in the drama of life and history, and also the object, as he seriously reflects on the fact and meaning of his existence. Moreover, this method of procedure is more in line with those socially minded thinkers who call themselves humanists. Whatever their theological deficiencies may be, they have a real contribution to make to the philosophy of peace in terms of their high regard and respect for the dignity and worth of human personality.

The most tragic thing in the world today next to the horrors of war, is that dwarfing of personality for which science is so largely responsible. First there came the astronomer, disclosing a universe so vast that man in comparison seemed to shrink into utter insignificance. Next came the biologist, showing that instead of being created by a single, special creative act as the darling of the universe, man sprang from an animal ancestry. He was followed by the psychologists, the behaviorists on the one hand trying to reduce man to a bundle of mechanical reflexes, and the Freudians on the other trying to reduce him to a subconscious process. Finally, to top it all, the physicist discovered atomic energy, in the presence of which man seems utterly hopeless and helpless.

Besides the scientists, two other influences played a part in this dwarfing of personality. There is the industrialist who utilizes the machines which science has made possible and uses men like so many robots to run them. Worse yet, there is that monstrosity, the totalitarian state seeking to reduce the individual to the mass man, together with the diabolical nature of modern warfare

which does not scruple at blowing up entire cities and converting them into mountains of rubble soaked with rivers of human blood. One shudders as he reads Gunther's account of the bestial cruelty of the Nazis in the destruction of Warsaw;[10] the only account which rivals it is John Hersey's *Hiroshima.*

Still, in the final analysis, in spite of his insignificance physically speaking, in spite of his descent from an animal ancestry, his many other limitations, and his seeming helplessness in the face of dark gigantic forces, man possesses gifts and powers which surpass and transcend all of these. To begin with, he alone has been blessed with the miracle of self-consciousness and creative reason which make at once the scientist with the capacity for an increasing mastery of nature, the statesman with the skill to build a new society devoid of the monstrous evils which plague mankind, and the philosopher who ventures boldly to tear the veil from the face of the Ultimate Mystery. These gifts make possible a freedom from circumstance and from the natural tendencies of his animal drives such as no other creature possesses.

There is likewise man's longing for beauty which has flowered and fruited in the sublimest songs, in great music and poetry, and in works of art magnificent beyond the power of puny words to describe. Greater still are his longings, his irrepressible longings after moral and spiritual perfection, after an unseen world of the spirit which seem to link him to a higher order, an order which transcends the natural and physical. The marvel of man becomes even greater when one contemplates what he has become and can become in spite of his humble origin. Surely, something higher and nobler than animal impulses and urges activates our human clay!

It may also be added that the value of personality is really the basis both of ethics and of democracy, and that most of the great religious systems,[11] but especially Judaism and Christianity, emphasize it in one way or another. Moreover, today as never before this insight must be taken seriously by freeing mankind from the curse of disease, ignorance, poverty, fear, and above all else war; so that man may freely develop and express his higher capacities in freedom and joy.

Thus a philosophy of peace adequate for these times must be fundamentally humanistic and personalistic.[12] As a matter of fact, this principle underlies the greatest document yet issued by the United Nations: The Universal Declaration of Human Rights.[13] Even the adoption of such a declaration by an organization as significant as the United Nations marks a step forward. The most important task, however, is to put it into effect. This is the task of the United Nations on a world scale; and in this noble venture men of all religions and men of no religion can and must join hands.

4. A PURPOSIVE UNIVERSE

The approach must now be made to the greatest and most significant of all questions: Is there Cosmic Purpose? Does God exist or is He merely a figment of the human imagination? In spite of the positivists and agnostics, this question will not down; it has a strange way of coming back again and again even to the most confirmed doubter.

As a matter of fact, life forces us to find an answer. More than this, it became clear in the last chapter that man cannot live well without some belief in a deeper, ultimate meaning in life. Nothing is more difficult than for man to live meaningfully on cosmic meaninglessness. The attempt may make him a neurotic like Hitler grasping at every straw of meaning, and ending with blind devotion to some monstrous idol, such as the totalitarian state.

Yet the modern thinker cannot approach even the profoundest and most significant questions dogmatically. To do so would provoke the Freudian charge that his conviction is based, not on fact, but on wishful thinking. If modern man is to believe in God, he must be shown that this affords the most reasonable explanation of life and of the universe.

In the final analysis, however, there are really only two strong arguments against the existence of God: the fact that He cannot be sensed, and the fact of evil. In answer to the first objection, it can be pointed out that we believe in many things which cannot be sensed: atoms which no scientist has ever seen but which are legitimate inferences from certain facts; the existence of our friend's thoughts and feelings which no one else can directly

experience but which are inferred from his expressions and actions; the ideals of truth, beauty, and goodness; and finally the facts of history long past. In short, if man actually tried to live merely by what he can sense, he would have to surrender his humanity and descend to the level of the animal.

The problem of evil presents greater difficulties. In fact, this writer is convinced that no reasonable solution is possible in terms of the old traditional idea of an omnipotent or all-powerful God. An omnipotent God, it seems reasonable to suppose, should have had the available means to create a more perfect world. At any rate, the vastness, power, and maldistribution of evil (so that the good and the weak often suffer far more than the wicked and the strong, the more able to bear), has undoubtedly produced more atheists than anything else. If, however, we think in terms of a God Who is perfect in goodness but limited in power, a God Who must struggle with certain recalcitrant elements not of his own making, the answer seems to have been found which best fits all the facts considered together:

> Here in life's chaos make no foolish boast
> That there is any God omnipotent,
> Seated serenely in the firmament,
> And looking down on men as on a host
> Of grasshoppers blown on a windy coast,
> Damned by disasters, maimed by mortal ill,
> Yet who could end it with one blast of Will.
> This God is all a man-created ghost.
>
> But there is a God who struggles with the All,
> And sounds across the world his danger-call
> He is the builder of roads, the breaker of bars,
> The One forever hurling back the Curse—
> The nail-torn Christus pressing toward the stars,
> The Hero of the battling universe.[14]

Only such a God could have created a strange world like ours with its many contradictions and its peculiar mixtures of good and evil. This view explains both the long, hard, patient, persistent struggle for peace and decency, and also evil, especially war, evil's most diabolical manifestation. The former is evidence of God's creative strivings for good through appropriate instru-

ments, while the latter well illustrates the tremendous opposition which He constantly encounters but which He ever seeks to overcome, transform, and transcend.

Those who reject this idea of God and continue to defend the traditional conception usually attempt to do so by taking refuge in human ignorance due to man's limitations or sin; they also plead the religious inadequacy of the limited God idea; and often they resort in desperation to the questionable device of trying to explain away the irrationalities of existence by attempting to reduce them to mere appearances. The first is, of course, the lazy argument which men always use when seeking an escape from a difficulty. It is always easy to fall back on man's ignorance and his creatural limitations in the face of baffling mysteries; but if this were done consistently man would never have climbed his Mount Everests. Besides, the plea of ignorance invites the suspicion that theism has no reasonable working answer, that its defenders in running away from a crucial problem are really confirming the Freudian theory that it is based on wishful thinking.

Nor is the argument based on supposed religious inadequacy valid. To begin with, we must accept the kind of God Who really exists (that is, the view of God most consistent with all the facts), not the kind we might wish to exist. Furthermore, the idea of a limited yet very powerful God struggling with evil can serve as a real challenge to high adventure—to come to His aid in making a peaceful world. Thus it serves as a solid foundation for the philosophy of peace. Again, the third argument, the attempt to reduce evil to mere appearance or explain it away, is both contrary to fact and downright dangerous. Nothing seems more real than the existence of wild, crazy, irrational elements in nature, in man, and in society as the following abundantly prove: a tornado destroying a church or hospital as indifferently as a den of vice; an atomic bomb dropping on a helpless city; a violently angry man; a mob out to lynch; and the curse of war itself down through the bloody ages. It also comes dangerously close to breaking down the distinctions between good and evil. This makes it easy for the defenders of war and other evils to say that these only seem to be evil in terms of their immediate consequences; but seen from the lofty battlements of Eternity or from the stand-

point of the Universe as a Whole, they blend into the total harmony as good, or at least as means to an ultimate good. The end result is to discourage the kind of crusading spirit so necessary to realize the prophetic dream of a warless world.

Our conclusion therefore must be that the conception of a powerful but struggling God Who meets real opposition, is more in line with an adequate philosophy of peace.[15] Besides, it has already become evident that this view is easier to defend since it explains both sets of facts encountered everywhere in human experience: the rational and good, and the irrational and evil. The time has now come to look at the many weighty lines of converging evidence pointing to the existence of God; and since this writer has a book in preparation dealing at length with this very important matter, he can afford to be brief.

There are first of all the many signs of order, design, and unity as found in natural forces, in plants, and in the bodies of men and animals. Second, the facts of evolution (astronomical, geological, biological, psychological, sociological, moral and spiritual), that is, the evidences of an ascending order developing, it seems, toward a goal.[16] Third, there is the existence of man himself with his higher capacities: self-consciousness, reason, freedom, and his esthetic, moral, and religious inclinations and longings. It is very difficult to see how a blind, unreasoning, morally indifferent universe could ever have produced such a creature. At any rate, in spite of what skeptics such as Reichenbach may say, on its higher levels, the Universe transcends the laws of physics; in its production of man with his capacities, we seem to catch a glimpse of its deeper, ultimate concern for values. Fourth, the great ideals—Truth, Beauty, and Goodness which haunt man leaving him restless, and find many concrete realizations in terms of values. Fifth, there are the facts of mysticism: men in all ages and all cultures have had the experience of coming in touch with what seemed to them a majestic Cosmic Power, a greater Mind or Life. Finally, one must reckon with the great religious systems, finding their peak, it is reasonable to suppose, in the highest forms of Judaism and Christianity.

While this massive array of evidence does not absolutely and finally prove the existence of God in the sense of mathematical

or logical demonstration, it does provide the foundation for a faith which can be both rational and vital without being in any sense dogmatic or authoritarian. In other words, as over against atheism, theism today as always seems to be the best answer to the mysteries of existence. Thus we have a rational basis for facing the irrationalities of life which ever threaten to overwhelm us like a tremendous tidal wave. This is the best cure for neurosis, since it makes it possible for the flickering spark of human reason to rest assured in the presence of an all-encompassing Cosmic Reason which, in spite of encountering terrific resistance, possesses a wisdom and strategy leading to new victories and triumphs.

In short, philosophy here lays the basis and prepares the way for a high religion which modern man can understand and to which he can give his allegiance of heart and mind; and high religion, hand in hand with philosophy, can deal effectively with fatalism, escapism, cynical relativism, and all other false philosophies which sap our strength, rendering us incapable of the lofty moral and spiritual adventure which this hour of decision demands. Nor is it too much to hope that high religion, with its superiority in rationality coupled with a tremendous conviction, may prove to be our chief protection against the dangerous materialistic philosophies of power and their bloodthirsty idols, those modern Molochs, the totalitarian states.

Again, while it is true that all internationalists are not and need not be theists, still it is clear that theism offers the best philosophical basis for internationalism and universalism. As a matter of fact, man's vision of peace began with ethical monotheism, belief in one righteous and just God, the God of all men, transcending all barriers, racial, national, and cultural. If there is really one God and He is the God and Father of all men, as most of the higher religions assert, then war is the really great sin. Theism also means that all men are brothers, thus serving to undergird The Universal Declaration of Human Rights and placing the dynamic of religious conviction at the disposal of the United Nations in its quest for understanding and peace.

Finally, there must be added a stern word of caution. Important as theism and high religion may be, the attempt must never be made to force them on others. This would be a reversion to

dogmatism and parochialism. Desirable as it may be, it is not even necessary that the sessions of the United Nations open with prayer if this offends some people. What is necessary above all else is that believers in God act according to their beliefs. In time perhaps even a few Communists might be impressed.

So far, however, most professed believers in God, faced with crucial situations, have acted little different from unbelievers, giving the impression of insincerity and even hypocrisy. The greatest blot on the Christian Church has been its proneness to bless war once the drums began beating. In fact, ever since the Emperor Constantine made Christianity the official religion of the Roman Empire back in the fourth century A.D., it has endorsed nearly every cruel, diabolical war that has been waged. The tragedy of it all is that the leaders of the Church have more often followed the opportunistic, shortsighted policies of politicians than the insights of the Church's own prophets. Too often the Christian Church has forgotten that its chief function is to be a Voice, not an echo, a Beacon on a mountain, not a pale reflection.

5. A REALISTIC IDEALISM

This writer believes that an adequate philosophy of peace must be fundamentally idealistic and personalistic. Such a system has the advantage of being in accord with the very greatest philosophical and religious systems on the one hand, and with a massive array of facts on the other. Likewise, from a pragmatic standpoint, it is superior since it is capable of inspiring men with hope and nerving them to creative action. One great danger is that men throw up their hands in despair simply because fatalism (this blind belief that everything is fixed and war is inevitable), has sapped the springs of action.

Finally, idealism, as the very name implies, is capable of placing before them great ideas, ideals, and goals. Of course, their full realization is impossible in a world like ours with so many unideal aspects. Yet men achieve most when challenged by the gleam of the highest; even the warmaker exploits this human tendency by trying to persuade his soldiers that they are fighting for a worthy end. Is it not high time for the peacemaker to use it to the limit?

Yet, for a world like ours which is always trying so hard to go back to the jungle and the sty, pure idealism is not enough. To be effective, it must be tempered with a mixture of stern realism. The ugly facts cannot be glossed over. They must be faced and met with patient, persistent, intelligent effort; an effort which never gives up or despairs of finding a way toward understanding and that faraway goal, perpetual peace.

Moreover, even as there is a philosophical basis for this ultimate idealism, so likewise there is a philosophical basis for the degree of realism demanded by the facts. It is found in the belief that even God faces obstructions in terms of factors not of His own making or choosing, from which the unideal aspects of the universe spring.

Still, realism need not mean getting "tough" and the old resort to war. Force undoubtedly has some use today, especially within a nation by that nation's *own police* when used rationally for the common welfare, as in quelling a riot and in preserving order. But, as the so-called "police action" in Korea decisively proves, when one nation or a group of nations, even in the name of the United Nations, uses it against another nation or nations, the end result is war and unspeakable suffering, destruction, and confusion.

Nothing is more certain today than that the old resort to war is archaic, hopelessly out of date. The idea of a "preventive war" is an escape mechanism, the attempt to escape from hard thinking and patient diplomatic effort in search of a peaceful and constructive solution to difficult problems. The handwriting is plainly written on the wall so that all may read: this generation must find a better solution than war or court unparalleled disaster. It must dare to substitute the council table for the battlefield, and rational, economic, and moral pressure by means of an aroused world opinion functioning through the United Nations, in place of military action. A few more Koreas and all may be lost!

Of course, it is easy to scoff at the mention of moral pressure. Many will be quick to contend that it is weak; it did not stop Hitler's legions nor will it stop any future aggressor. Yet the so-called realists who use this argument forget many facts. To begin with, moral pressure must never be used alone: it must

always be coupled with rational and economic pressure; and more than all else, it must be sincere, motivated by a real desire for justice for all. Second, it must be applied before the disease has gone too far. Perhaps if the United States had joined the League of Nations, and the League could have been strong and impartial enough to correct the injustices of the Treaty of Versailles, Hitler might never have arisen.

Again, it is evident that no one is winning the get "tough" policy while many are becoming disillusioned and turning toward other means. At any rate, the will to peace is becoming stronger; millions in every land as they look into the flaming pit of hell want peace. If this tremendous will to peace becomes aflame with moral passion and finds its center in the United Nations, it might sweep away all barriers. No nation, not even Russia, could afford to lose face by risking condemnation by this august tribunal. In fact, John J. McCloy, retiring U. S. High Commissioner for Germany, has gone so far as to say:

> Even a totalitarian government can be moved by moral pressure. The Soviets have confidence in public opinion, they recognize its strength and they don't like its strength being pressed against them.[17]

An international policy based primarily on the moral pressure of public opinion would find strong support in the philosophy which has been outlined in this chapter; and it may well be that this is the wave of the future. Perhaps, as men and nations once placed their faith in armaments, the time is at hand when realizing that instead of security these will bring destruction upon friend and foe alike, they will at long last turn in this more creative direction. Still, it must be kept in mind that moral pressure can only function effectively as an aspect of a much broader and comprehensive peace policy. Therefore, it is time to turn from the philosophical basis of peace toward an investigation of the causes of war and an adequate peace strategy.

NOTES

1 For the rich possibilities of such an emerging world civilization, see Toynbee, *Civilization on Trial,* pp. 90-94.

2 Stoicism, for example, provided the basis of the broader, universal aspects of Roman law; and the modern peace movement owes a great debt to the philosopher Kant.

3 See "The Golden Sayings of Epictetus" in Eliot (ed.), *The Harvard Classics,* Vol. 2, p. 122.

4 See also previous discussion, pp. 42-43.

5 For an attempt to answer the difficult question as to the tests of truth, see this writer's article, "The Basis of Authority in Religion," in *The Journal of Bible and Religion,* Vol. XX, No. 4, October, 1952, pp. 255-59.

6 For a more adequate statement of this argument, see this writer's *History and God,* pp. 159-64.

7 See his *Human Destiny,* pp. 127-34, 195-96, 250-53.

8 Stringfellow Barr has estimated that the regular program of the United Nations costs Americans about sixteen cents per capita; see his *Citizens of the World,* pp. 274-75, note 13. This would be increased to sixty-two cents per person if other contributions are also considered.

9 Sherwood Eddy, *God in History,* p. 159 (New York: Association Press, 1947). Used by permission.

10 See Gunther, *Behind the Curtain,* pp. 249-52, 265-66.

11 That is, except certain Hindu and Buddhist groups who look upon life as little more than an illusion or a spell which ought to be ended by preparing for absorption in Brahma or the ultimate dissolution which Buddhists call Nirvana. Some of them, however, think of Nirvana in terms of personal immortality.

12 On the significance of personality, see Flewelling, *The Survival of Western Culture,* pp. 206-16; Brightman, "Persons and Values"; and Barry, *The Recovery of Man,* pp. 17-38.

13 See Fenichell and Andrews, *The United Nations,* pp. 73-85. This is an excellent little book, well illustrated.

14 Edwin Markham, *The Nail-Torn God,* in *Poems of Edwin Markham* (selected and arranged by Charles L. Wallis), p. 99 (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950). Copyrighted 1950 by Virgil Markham and used by his permission.

15 For more adequate defenses of this view of God, see Brightman, *A Philosophy of Religion,* pp. 240-341; Patterson, "Can Man Know God?" in *The Journal of Bible and Religion,* Vol. XX, No. 3, July 1952, pp. 176-81; and Munk, *op. cit.,* pp. 197-242. The most able

recent criticism of the limited God idea is in DeWolf, *The Religious Revolt Against Reason,* pp. 170-74, 184-85.

16 The best recent statement of this argument is found in du Noüy, *op. cit.,* pp. 26-35, 103-273.

17 As reported in *The Detroit Free Press,* July 17, 1952, p. 1.

Part II

TOWARD AN ADEQUATE PEACE STRATEGY

CHAPTER FOUR

The Supposed Enemy and the Real Enemy

1. THE SUPPOSED ENEMY

As is usually the case, wars raise more problems than they solve. One of the dire consequences of the Second World War is that it so greatly weakened most of the once great powers that only two remain: the United States and Russia; but with China perhaps developing into a third. Possessing different ideologies which never ceased to be at war with one another even while they were allies, and both intoxicated with power mixed with fear and suspicion of one another, it is natural that they should consider each other as enemies. In fact, each one can make a good case against the other.

(1) *An American Criticism of Russia*

Let us begin at home with the United States by considering her case against Russia. She suspects the latter for many reasons. On the surface there is the vast might of the Red Army, Russia's increasing air and submarine striking power, and the fact that she now has both the atom and hydrogen bombs which constitute a major threat to American cities. More insidious yet is the effect of Soviet propaganda. In the very apt words of Toynbee:

> The Communist weapon that is making America so jumpy (and, oddly enough, she is reacting more temperamentally to this threat than the less sheltered countries of Western Europe) is the spiritual engine of propaganda. Communist propaganda has a 'know-how' of its own for showing up and magnifying the seamy side of our Western civilization and for making Communism appear a desirable alternative way of life to a dissatisfied faction of Western men and women. Communism is also a competitor for the allegiance of that great majority of

> mankind that is neither Communist nor Capitalist, neither Russian nor Western, but is living at present in an uneasy no-man's-land between the opposing citadels of the two rival ideologies.[1]

Going deeper, the American critic points out that, according to the Marxian philosophy of history, Communism is destined to conquer the world. Nor, according to Communist theory, will this process proceed in an evolutionary non-violent way. As Capitalism shows increasing signs of decay, the workers in every land must rise up; they must hasten the coming of the new society by overthrowing the existing regimes and taking control:

> The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workingmen of all countries, unite![2]

Along with the Communistic philosophy of history and theory of revolution, the American protests vigorously against Marxian political practices, above all else the dictatorship of the workers. He insists this means the destruction of freedom and the establishment of a police state: the secret police, the forced labor camps, and that curtain of secrecy and violence under which tyranny flourishes. Even though the Communist claims this dictatorship, unlike the Nazi and Fascist, is not the end and goal but only the means to the end and goal which will disappear once the classless society has been reached, still the Western critic is not convinced. He will insist that any dictatorship is hard to dislodge once it has established itself; for it possesses the means to perpetuate itself. Moreover, possessing such vast power (and since all power is corrupting), it will produce unspeakable corruption followed by bloody purges.

Similarly, the American objects to Marxian ethics: it seems to have little regard for truth and the moral law but twists everything to serve party ends. In other words, the end justifies the means—the loyal Communist is not only free but even obligated to do whatever enhances the party. This also results in utter dis-

regard for the individual as a person: the party, the state, and the leaders alone seem to count.

The critic goes on to point the finger of scorn at Marxian dogmatism and self-righteousness. The Communist is convinced his theory is absolutely right; anyone even within the party who arouses the slightest suspicion of being unorthodox is punished, reminding one of the Inquisition. In short, the party is infallible, entirely above criticism; it always does what is right and must be obeyed to the letter. Worse yet, the attempt is made to force all the arts and sciences within the procrustean bed of the totalitarian pattern.

Then the Marxian attitude toward religion must not be forgotten: all religion, good and bad, high and low, is unfairly and uncritically placed under exactly the same condemnation as "the opiate of the people." God is dethroned in favor of the blind, impersonal, economic forces; or, as Communism becomes increasingly more nationalistic, the Russian state and its deified rulers usurp His place. To the Russian answer that religion is tolerated in Russia today, the retort is made: but at a heavy price—it dare not criticize the infallible party and state; in fact, it has been reduced to little more than a tool.

Finally, many concrete cases are cited. That the Soviets are bent on world revolution and conquest is evidenced by the existence of Moscow controlled parties in virtually every country, and by the support furnished them by the Kremlin, making the overthrow of established governments far easier. China and Czechoslovakia are cases in point. Moreover, there are many evidences of tyranny: the very existence of the "iron curtain"; the purges occurring from time to time; the suppression of scientists who refuse to conform; and above all else the violent suppression of any signs of restlessness of which the events in East Germany furnish the best recent examples.

When thus viewed there can be no doubt but that America has a real case against Russia which must not and cannot be lightly dismissed without doing violence to the truth. Especially is this true when the latter's obstructionist tactics, as displayed in the United Nations and elsewhere, are added to the list.[3] There can be no doubt but that the Soviet Union is one of the most hated

of all nations. This is abundantly confirmed by what is taking place in East Germany.

(2) *A Russian Criticism of America*

Yet it must be remembered that many Americans are just as blind, prejudiced, and self-righteous as the Russians. In an apt criticism of both, Sorokin has truly said:

> If one listens to the Russian Communist bloc, it depicts itself as marvelous, irreproachable, peace-loving, creative, unfailingly just and generous, in contrast to the "decaying capitalist-imperialist-warmongering-murderous-greedy American bloc of Wall Streeters." If one listens to the Western bloc of nations, he hears again the voice of sinful pride, the same self-glorification and vilification in reverse: the Western world is depicted as being sinless, pure, generous, peace-loving, kind, constructive, free and "holier than thou"; and the whole blame for the cold war and for all the troubles of the world is put upon these "godless, atheistic, power-drunk, Communist beasts and their victimized nations." [4]

It must be understood to begin with that the Russians are for the most part just as sincerely suspicious of the United States as the latter is of them. Nor are Soviet suspicions as baseless as Americans sometimes suppose. First of all, Communists fear the capitalistic nations have designs upon them politically and militarily. They base this fear partly on Marxian dogma and partly on historical facts. According to Communist theory, Capitalism in its last stages of decay will turn fascistic and will make an attempt to crush the young emerging communist society. This the devout Marxian believes with almost religious zeal since it is clearly implied in his creed, *The Communist Manifesto.*

Moreover, as Howard K. Smith has rightly warned the West:

> The Russian dogma of capitalist hostility and inevitable clashes is a disturbing element in our world. But the blind, dogged efforts between the wars of so many outside nations to make the dogma seem to the Russians the Lord's own truth has been just as disturbing.[5]

He goes on to point out that following the First World War, in a determined effort to destroy the Soviet regime, the country was invaded by no less than fourteen nations, a process which degenerated into mass looting and murdering, costing Russia some seven million lives and sixty billion dollars. Even the American commander did not favor it, and it was vigorously denounced in Congress by Senator Borah.[6] For these American troops in Russia were helping to wage a war without a declaration of war by Congress; they were acting entirely upon the initiative of the President.[7]

Worse still, during the period between the two wars the British made a number of attempts to overthrow the Soviet Government; and later they showed special kindness to Hitler, which policy found its culmination in Munich, a conference to which Russia was not even invited.[8] Is there any wonder she came to believe the Tories were seeking to build Hitler up against her, vainly hoping to use him as their tool to crush the Soviet Union?

In fact, as Smith points out, Russia has always been a temptation to conquerors. Since 1800 there have been not less than fourteen foreign invasions; Minsk has been occupied by foreign armies one hundred and one times; Kiev has been razed so many times the inhabitants have lost count; and the invasions since 1914 have cost over twenty million lives.[9] It is no wonder that Russia views with a suspicion bordering on the paranoiac such policies of ours as the following: our vast military machine well equipped with atom bombs; our armies and military missions in various countries; our troops engaged for three years in fighting a hot war in Korea close to the Russian border but thousands of miles from our own; military bases scattered all over the world; our dollars lavishly spent often to help bolster some of the most reactionary regimes; and to top it all, verbal threats by the more vocal American militarists.

Again, in viewing our domestic scene, the Russians find much which gives point to their propaganda. While we shout to the world how democratic and free America is, millions of Negroes are still denied their rights, an attempt is made to suppress academic freedom and to intimidate the liberal clergy, while some of the worst hatemongers and warmongers are elected to office. In fact, in some sections of the country the easiest way to get elected is

not by offering a constructive program but merely by breathing volleys of hate against Communism.

Thus it is evident the Russians also have a case which cannot be lightly dismissed.[10] To attempt to dismiss it lightly or to laugh it off is dangerous. Already such an attitude has cost us billions of dollars, vastly more in loss of prestige around the world, and worst of all, the loss of thousands of the very flower of our youth in a war no one wanted and all would like to forget.[11]

(3) *An Appeal to Reason*

The very fact both America and Russia can make such strong cases indicates both contain truth. On this basis this writer will attempt an appeal both to his fellow countrymen and to our supposed enemies. Though few of the former may take it to heart, and few, if any, of the latter will even read this volume, yet one must do what he can. Then, if calamity falls black and stark he has at least the satisfaction of having delivered his own soul.

First of all, both should show some signs of humility, enough at least to recognize that neither is perfect and both are partly right. Next it is well for them to consider how many things they have in common: a priceless common heritage from Greece and Palestine; mixed populations of many racial strains (giving both a marked cosmopolitan appearance and showing it is possible for many races to live together in peace) but with a dominant element of the Indo-European variety of the Caucasian; both borrowed very heavily from the scientific and industrial achievements of Western Europe; aside from certain minor disturbances more than a hundred and twenty-five years of peaceful relationships; they were allies in a vast struggle against Nazism and Fascism in which each would have fared ill without the other; both have had revolutions which have advanced the cause of justice, the American chiefly in the political field, the Russian in the economic; both claim to be democracies; and last and perhaps most significant of all, as the world's two greatest powers, they have the greatest responsibility. To this list one other might be added: since they have not used their power wisely, they are also fast becoming the two most hated nations.

Let them then exert every effort to come to an understanding around the council table before the darkness falls. Failure to do this will cause history to write that these two great nations had one other thing in common: A COMMON DOOM. This possibility should serve to bring them to their senses; it should make them understand that their real enemy, their common enemy is: *WAR.*

One hesitates to paint the horrible picture of what a Third World War might be like. Yet reason requires that we look at the cost while there is still time to avert it before we stumble on the "twilight mountains." Therefore, with no sadistic desire for scaremongering, but with a sense of responsibility to awaken the men in the two hostile camps concerning their real enemy, an attempt will be made to picture the staggering cost of a Third World War. For Norman Cousins has rightly said that the vast destructive potentialities of modern atomic warfare must be presented dramatically and kept before the public eye, thus serving to arouse man's desire to survive.[12] This shall be the purpose of the rest of this chapter, leaving to later chapters the vital problem of the causes and cure of war, and specific suggestions concerning strategy.

2. THE REAL ENEMY: A THIRD WORLD WAR

(1) *The Material Costs*

A widely known world federalist once said that when he talked about the human costs of war in terms of their sons most people showed less interest than when he discussed the material costs, what it would do to their pocketbooks. In fact, there are still those who favor war because of the feverish wave of superficial, temporary prosperity which it brings. One cannot down the strange suspicion that one reason why more was not done to put a quick end to the Korean War was the fear of depression. It does not increase one's respect for human nature to contemplate the fact that some are so thoughtless and hard-hearted as to be willing to coin the blood and tears of their fellow mortals into gold.

Yet, whatever temporary prosperity these modern bloodlettings may bring, sooner or later they lead nations to bankruptcy. It is interesting to note that, according to army reports, the cost of

war to the United States has multiplied not less than two hundred forty-five times within a century.[13] The direct cost of the First World War to our country alone was nearly enough to pay the expense of maintaining the government from 1791 to 1914, while the total cost to all the belligerents came to nearly three hundred and thirty-seven billion dollars; and it is estimated to have decreased the national wealth of Great Britain 12.7%, France 25%, Italy 20%, and Germany 26%.[14]

But this is only a fraction of the astronomical price of the Second World War. A rather conservative estimate places it at not less than three hundred and thirty-two billion dollars to the United States alone.[15] In other words, the Second cost America alone nearly as much as the First cost all nations! The expense to other countries was approximately as follows: Russia, four hundred and eighty-five billion dollars; Germany, two hundred and seventy-two billion; France, one hundred and ninety-two billion; and Great Britain one hundred and twenty billion.[16] To this must also be added the loss in natural resources, especially in the invaded lands. Consequently, when all items are considered the total expense of the Second World War, according to a statement made by the Bank of International Settlements, reaches the stupendous sum of one trillion three hundred and fifty-two billion dollars, about four times the cost of the First.[17] This is a figure so vast, it taxes the imagination to even remotely conceive it. Thus, economically, as well as in other ways, war has become utterly fantastic.

How evil modern warfare is even from the economic standpoint cannot be fully comprehended until one remembers that economic values are relative to human values, that life cannot go on without physical resources, and without life or with the crippling of life the higher values cannot be realized. Thus the destruction of houses in human terms means the disruption of families; the demolition of schools and churches means the hindering of education and religion, together with character development; and ruined farms, factories, and railroads mean stopping the production, preparation, and distribution of food. The end result spells a monstrous human suffering and despair. This writer cannot forget the story of the Dutch refugee who told of his wife having to wade a mile daily through water up to her neck, during the Nazi oc-

cupation of Holland, in order to get a single bottle of milk for her family. Americans can still talk glibly about war prosperity because they know little about the discomforts, the inconveniences, the inhumanity, the stark horrors of war; but they had best beware lest some ill-fated tomorrow it may come to them suddenly from flaming skies.

Moreover, it is well to consider the good which might have been done with the resources wasted by war. According to one estimate, the financial cost of the Second World War could have provided the following: a $33,600 house, $11,200 worth of furniture, and $56,000 cash for every family in the United States, Canada, Austria, Britain, Ireland, France, Germany, Russia, and Belgium; and besides this, every town with a population over two hundred thousand could have been given $70,000,000 for libraries, $70,000,000 for schools, and $70,000,000 for hospitals.[18] Instead, this vast sum was used to kill and destroy, to undermine the very foundations of the temple of civilization and order.

Nor is this the end. Today the nations are engaged in the greatest peace-time armament race in the annals of history, costing astronomical sums every year. The Eighty-second Congress, let it be remembered, appropriated the gigantic sum of $91,626,541,746 for all purposes, about eighty-five per cent of which, not less than $77,201,739,830 went for defense purposes, the largest amount ever designated for this purpose during peace-time.[19] At present the Eisenhower Administration, in the endeavor to fulfill its pledge of economy, is desperately trying to cut down military costs with some success.[20] Yet, when both the direct and indirect costs of war are considered, the amount spent will still be vast enough to stagger the imagination; and since no real move has been made toward disarmament and peace, new international crises may force the Administration to increase defense spending.

A few more figures will certainly convince any thoughtful person that the safety of our country is endangered by nothing short of a bankruptcy which may come sooner than we think. For whereas in 1915 the national debt was only $1,191,264,068 or $11.85 per capita, by 1919, after the First World War, it had climbed to $25,482,034,419 or $242.54 per capita, and by 1952, largely as the result of the Second World War and the Korean War, it was

no less than $259,105,178,785 or $1,649.98 per capita, an astounding increase![21] Worse yet, some months ago President Eisenhower told us that it was over $265,000,000,000, not far from the two hundred and seventy-five billion limit set by the government.[22] Moreover, in this year of prosperity and high income there will be a deficit of eight and a half billion dollars, about two and a half billion more than former President Truman had estimated in his January budget.[23]

The answer of many superficial thinkers, even including some economists, is, of course, that our income is high and is even increasing. However, they tend to forget certain facts: there is a limit to our fast vanishing resources; even in this time of plenty there is a deficit; our present war-inflated prosperity may soon end in depression; and above all else, the lesson of history. What is the lesson of history? He who runs may read it: war bankrupts nations, no matter how great and rich and strong they may be. It happened in the case of Rome, of France, Italy, Germany, Britain, and it can happen here! In fact, his back broken by taxes, some unhappy day the American citizen, in his search for a phantom security, may be ready to sell his birthright of freedom to some potential dictator coming to him with rosy promises.

Furthermore, in this process of pauperizing ourselves, the Russians may be winning their greatest victory. Indeed, it may even serve to confirm their belief in the Marxian interpretation of history. Yet, how can Russia boast when she, too, is bleeding herself to death? With the deep wounds inflicted by the last terrible conflict still not healed, with the relatively low standard of living still forced upon her citizens, with the dark mutterings of revolt, and with the increasingly vast sums of her wealth drained into unproductive military projects, all cannot be well with her. In short, it would be to the advantage of both nations, as well as to all nations, for them to change their ways lest they fall into the same ditch.

(2) *The Political Costs*

Americans profess a love of democracy and freedom; and they claim to have fought two great wars to defend these values. Yet the sober truth is that with each war there is less of both. The

First World War destroyed, it is true, a number of tyrannical regimes, but it gave the Communists their opportunity in Russia (which, though in some ways an improvement, yet constitutes a dictatorship feared by the West), and worse yet, it led to the Fascist regime in Italy, the Nazi in Germany, and the Japanese war machine. The Second World War destroyed the last three, yet democracy is in mortal danger; for Communism has become more and more fascistic and aggressive. In fact, it has captured many countries, including China where about a fourth of the human race lives, and it is threatening many others. Nor are the old brands of Fascism and Nazism really dead. The great danger is that nations like Germany, Italy, Japan, and even France turn toward the extreme right or the extreme left. At any rate, their future is problematical; so problematical, as a matter of fact, that it is dangerous to gamble upon them as allies.

Again, democracy is far from being vigorous, healthy, and safe even within America, its professed citadel. On the wave of a hysterical fear of Communism, reactionary politicians who threaten our liberties are riding to power. Between these and the growing power of the militarists, freedom may be crushed to death. The persistent effort of certain interested groups to fasten the curse of universal military training on the people, the vast increase in armaments, together with the danger of creating an American model of the Prussian General Staff, undemocratic legislation such as the McCarran Act, character assassination by guilt through association, and the many violations of academic freedom, including book burning, are ominous signs. A dark cloud hangs low upon America's horizon, threatening the very highest values which it has upheld before the world for over a hundred and seventy-five years. Indeed, so great is the fear of being called subversive that many are afraid of speaking out for peace. This has led Justice Douglas to say:

> Everyone who does not follow the military policy-makers is suspect. Everyone who voices opposition to the trend away from diplomacy and away from political tactics takes a chance. Some who are opposed are indeed "subversive." Therefore, the thundering edict commands that all are "subversive." Fear

is fanned to a fury. Good and honest men are pilloried. Character is assassinated. Fear runs rampant.[24]

What is at the basis of this hysterical tendency away from democracy toward fascism? The answer is simply: our war psychology. But if America reacted like this when only a minor war was on and when a major one only threatened, it is easy to guess what the situation would be like if it broke suddenly in all its wild fury. Nor can there be any doubt but that the public would submit, and submit gladly to rigid and complete regimentation. Today our sons are being drafted, and already they are greedily eying our daughters for possible drafting tomorrow. Moreover, if the present tendencies continue long enough and the powers that be become convinced of the likelihood of an atomic war, everyone will be drafted except babies; not even business and "free enterprise" nor the rights of labor will be respected. If that day comes (and let us pray God it may never come), democracy will certainly perish from the earth, perhaps not to reappear for ten thousand years.

Thus it is evident one of the chief reasons for justifying wars, so often in the past, is gone. Instead of protecting and preserving freedom, each one destroys liberty; and a Third World War would undoubtedly obliterate it. What incentive is there left to fight? Democracy can only survive as men learn to sacrifice for peace as they once sacrificed for war. The greatest patriot in any land is not the soldier but the peacemaker.

(3) *The Human Costs*

It has become evident that in a real sense the economic and political costs of war are also human costs. When war disrupts the economic processes which minister to life, human beings suffer and die. Similarly, when freedom is lost and men are regimented like ants, the dignity of personality is violated, and the more sensitive natures often die from broken hearts.

But the effort must now be made to consider more directly the human costs in terms of lives lost and the suffering inflicted through the many ghastly means employed by so-called civilized beings to slaughter their fellows. As one studies the results of war down the centuries, one monstrous fact stands out in bold relief: as man

has succeeded in perfecting his weapons, it has become increasingly more deadly.[25] The invention of gunpowder not only spelled the doom of feudalism, but it also greatly enhanced man's power to kill. The most frightful conflict before the two World Wars was undoubtedly the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648), which, according to one estimate, decreased the population of Germany by over twelve million, and that of France by over two and a half million.[26]

The two World Wars lasted only a fraction as long, but were far more destructive. If they had lasted as long as the Thirty Years' War, it is doubtful whether our Western civilization would have survived the shock. No one knows how many lives (both soldiers and civilians) were wiped out during these two killing sprees; only approximations are possible, and these vary considerably. Benns thinks nearly nine million men lost their lives in battle and twenty-two million were wounded during the First World War; and he adds that the loss of civilian life was just as great or perhaps even greater.[27] In fact, some authorities believe the total deaths due to all causes attributable to the war may have gone over forty million—a stupendous number![28]

The Second World War was even more world-wide than the First and considerably more disastrous. Of Warsaw's one million three hundred thousand population, some seven hundred thousand were killed. For the first time, at least in our day, a systematic attempt was made to completely annihilate two peoples: the Jews and the Poles. It is estimated that Poland alone lost twenty per cent of its population, not less than six million;[29] and, according to the Institute of Jewish Affairs of the World Jewish Congress, the Nazis killed seventy-one per cent of the Jews in Europe, about five million, eight hundred thousand.[30] In short, when the deaths of all nations due to the Second World War are taken into account, it is probable the total will be twice that of the First.[31]

This does not take into account the vast number of displaced persons, many of whom were subjected to unspeakable suffering and misery. The Nazis deported from Poland alone some three million slave laborers to grind out their lives in Germany, and millions of others from other conquered countries. Later the Poles, in revenge as well as for economic reasons, expelled some eight and a half million Germans from the land taken from Germany.[32] In

short, when one takes into consideration the total human cost of the Second World War, it is seen as nothing less than the greatest period of human suffering and misery in all the annals of man.

However, in comparison to the human cost of a possible Third World War, the Second would undoubtedly look like a pink tea party; for the latter closed with the advent of the fiery atomic age. No one knows accurately to this day how many people were killed by the two bombs which fell on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. According to the most reliable reports, about eighty thousand died at Hiroshima, and about forty-five thousand at Nagasaki; besides this, from eighty thousand to one hundred thousand were injured at the former, and about fifty thousand to sixty thousand at the latter.[33]

But these puny bombs capable of killing at the most only about a hundred thousand human beings are definitely out of date. The newer varieties are far more powerful. Besides the greater blast effect which destroys human beings outright and the deadly gamma rays, the atomic bomb can be loaded with copper or some other substance which, following the explosion, becomes so much radioactive dust. Carried by the wind this deadly dust might settle over a whole of one of our larger states or even over half the country.[34] Above all else, the Bikini tests proved the extreme dangers of radioactivity lingering after the effects of the original blast are gone. David Bradley summarizes his conclusions as follows:

> (1) There is no real defense against atomic weapons.
>
> (2) There are no satisfactory countermeasures and methods of decontamination.
>
> (3) There are no satisfactory medical or sanitary safeguards for the people of atomized areas.
>
> (4) The devastating influence of the Bomb and its unborn relatives may affect the land and its wealth—and therefore its people—for centuries through the persistence of radioactivity.[35]

It is true that the atomic scientist, Ralph E. Lapp, in his recent book, *The New Force,* is considerably more conservative relative to the lasting effects of radioactivity, yet he, too, recognizes its dangers in admitting that the radioactive material of the bomb was trapped in the Bikini lagoon; and he also admits that the bombs used were the old-fashioned Nagasaki type.[36]

Another terrible effect of the atomic bomb after the powerful first blast is the danger from fires; for they break out almost instantaneously all over a stricken city spreading death, terror, and unparalleled destruction far and wide. Moreover, the force of the original blast is likely to put all fire-fighting equipment out of commission.[37] Worse yet, the total impact of the bomb tends to paralyze the entire life of a city where it does not outright destroy, thus virtually reducing it to helplessness. Only those who are far below the surface and out of the way of the main blast have the best chance for survival.

Since both Russia and the United States are fast accumulating atom bombs and since they have the long range planes to deliver them, the dangers of atomic attack are real. In other words, for the first time our oceans offer little security against hostile aircraft carrying atomic bombs. While still Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General Hoyt S. Vandenberg warned that out of an attacking force of one hundred airplanes, even under the best conditions, only about thirty per cent could be knocked out at present.[38] This means not less than seventy out of a possible one hundred would get through to deliver their deadly cargo. Thus an enemy by means of suicide squads could reduce our great cities to rubble.[39]

For seven years Einstein, Urey, Oppenheimer, Morrison and other leading scientists have given similar warnings.[40] Recently an eminent group of scientists, engaged in research on the air defense problem at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, issued a grave warning that in case of an attack less than ten per cent of the enemy planes would probably be knocked out by our air force, and that within two years Russia will have enough atomic bombs to "cripple" or even "devastate" the United States.[41] In a similar vein, Dr. Lloyd V. Berkner, President of Associated Universities, Inc., which operates the Brookhaven National Laboratory for the Atomic Energy Commission, in a speech to his colleagues, leading designers of the atomic and hydrogen bombs, very dramatically warned them that in spite of its terrific striking power our country has acquired a "glass jaw," making it extremely vulnerable to atomic attack. He also insisted that real defensive measures are lacking; and that the increasing offensive potentialities of our mass

weapons constitute a dangerous threat to civilization.[42] Similarly, Vannevar Bush warns of the dangers of submarine attack:

> We must take into account the delivery of bombs by submarine, the bombs being lobbed into coastal cities by rocket projectors perhaps from submarines twenty-five to fifty miles at sea. This is no mean threat; such an attack can be made if an enemy has atomic bombs and submarines that can move into position while submerged, do the necessary aiming, and fire their missiles without detection. If the submarine were generally overcome without question, we could dismiss this aspect but the submarine is by no means overcome, and the scales have recently tipped in favor of the attack as far as undersea warfare is concerned.[43]

Then there is biological warfare. At least three different kinds of agents might be used: living things, such as bacteria and viruses; concentrated toxins or poisons obtained from bacteria; and certain kinds of chemicals. Biological warfare could be especially successful following an atomic attack while the victim was still dazed. Germs could easily be sprayed from planes or germs or toxins could be packed into special bombs. Food could also be poisoned by spies and secret agents working within an enemy country. Some authorities, such as Dr. Brock Chisholm of the World Health Organization, are especially apprehensive of this type of warfare. In fact, he fears it even more than the atom bomb, which he believes has been made obsolete along with armies, navies, and air forces.[44]

Even more destructive than all other weapons combined is that King of Terrors, the hydrogen bomb. The first successful test was conducted on November 1, 1952 at Eniwetok Atoll; but the details remain shrouded in a cloud of secrecy. However, we do know from letters written by men stationed in ships about thirty-five miles from the test island that the light of the blast seemed ten times brighter than the sun; that a flame about two miles wide and five miles high appeared, followed by tons of earth; and that an entire island disappeared.[45]

Yet the bomb which was exploded was but an infant in comparison with the mightier ones which may soon be available. Dr. Hans A. Bethe, the father of the hydrogen bomb, predicts that eventually

it may be a thousand times as powerful as the atom bomb, that if a city like Chicago were hit it would go up like a flash; and in case of war not only our cities but civilization itself would be destroyed.[46] Einstein fears that the radioactivity emanating from the explosion of a large number of such bombs might poison the atmosphere and destroy all life; and Urey believes it may be the ultimate, absolute, and decisive weapon in war.[47] Dr. Lapp thinks there is virtually no limit to the size and power of such superbombs. However, he issues a stern warning which Americans had better take to heart: the hydrogen bomb will not add to the security of the United States; for Russia will soon have it, and the concentrations of our population in a number of large cities will make better targets for this kind of weapon than the far more dispersed population of the Soviet Union. In fact, he fears that an attack with hydrogen bombs might knock us out.[48]

From this brief survey of the nature and dire possibilities of the new weapons, our thesis that war must be prevented at any cost, that it is the greatest enemy of mankind, and that military weapons can no longer protect us is thrice sustained. This is what Einstein and certain other great scientists have been trying to tell us for many years, yet the American public has refused to listen.[49] Even a scientist as close to the government as Vannevar Bush, and therefore naturally conservative, in his discussion of the possibilities of defense in case of an atomic attack, in the end has to admit:

> We are building bombs, we are building planes to deliver them, but we are not putting all-out effort into building a defensive radar net at the present time. . . . There is little doubt that any attempt to apply such an elaborate defense system to an enormous area would be exhausting in its expense and could hardly be so successful as to confer complete immunity even then. . . . The major effort should go into bombs and their delivery, until logic shows that a substantial defense effort should be added.[50]

In other words, rather than building up our defenses, here he suggests that we make our striking power more deadly. No thoughtful person will find much comfort in such assurance. What good will it do us to know our atomic armadas have killed some sixty

or seventy million Russians when Russian attacks at the same time have slaughtered forty or fifty million Americans and left New York, Washington, Detroit, and Chicago a mass of shambles? This shows two things: that modern warfare is absolutely indefensible from a moral and humanitarian standpoint, and that the militarist is utterly bankrupt when it comes to offering any real security.

It is true that just recently certain groups of scientists have claimed some kind of defense is possible. The most interesting is proposed by the distinguished scientist, Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer and his associates. In place of the present policy of depending largely on our striking power, he proposes making defense our primary purpose by turning the country into a great fortress protected by a warning system of interlocking radar stations far out on the Arctic and back of this a mighty air fleet on continuous patrol and armed with guided missiles and other super-weapons.[51] The group of scientists at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, among whom was one of Oppenheimer's leading associates, Dr. Lloyd V. Berkner (and to which group Oppenheimer himself acted as one of the chief consultants), have come forward with a similar proposal. In fact, they believe that a reasonable defense is possible now. Moreover, they are doing all in their power to convince the Government.[52]

However, when one examines these proposed plans certain great difficulties arise. First, they cannot and do not guarantee an absolute, one hundred per cent defense. Some enemy airplanes and submarines are bound to break through somewhere; and with their atom or hydrogen bombs that means the possible destruction of so many cities. Nor can our scientists be sure that the enemy does not have surprises. In fact, the enemy's scientists may also be fully aware of the defenses which are being built and may find means to overcome them. A physicist, a specialist in radar who worked on this very thing at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology during the war, reminds us that the British, in spite of all their efforts, were unable to stop more than seventy per cent of the German V-1's. Moreover, in time the latter became wiser and produced the V-2 rocket which traveled four thousand miles an hour, so fast that radar could not track it.[53] As a result there was

no defense; and this can happen again no matter how carefully we plan.

Second, a careful reading of such material as the writer has found available shows that these proposed plans are still to a great extent in the theoretical stage. Nor can they really be tested till war comes; and then any real weaknesses may prove fatal. Finally, the expense may be nothing short of prohibitive, especially when it is proposed to undertake a vast decentralization project. Thus, when these schemes for defense are examined in the light of reason and of history, there arises the haunting suspicion that some of our scientists, in spite of a sincere desire to be helpful, may be following a dangerous delusion. Yet this dream of a Maginot line is far less dangerous than our Government's present policy of relying almost altogether on the belief in the efficacy of the knockout blow. Still far more rational than either, however, is the great Einstein's belief in the elimination of war through international understanding and cooperation. This is the only real solution to the atomic threat. More will be said about this later.

Two popular illusions must also be given brief consideration. The first is the idea that the new weapons have been greatly overrated, that men made similar prophecies of doom when gunpowder first came to be used. There is a certain amount of truth in this objection: some popular writers have undoubtedly gone to extremes. But after due allowance has been made for these exaggerations, a number of facts stand out. First, it cannot be denied that even gunpowder proved rather deadly: it made the armored knight and the stone castle obsolete; and it certainly proved its effectiveness in the terrible Thirty Years' War. Second, sober scientists are greatly alarmed and are trying to warn people. Finally, a single discharge from the gun and other conventional weapons kills, even at best, only a small fraction of the number which the first atomic bombs killed; one atom bomb can devastate a fairly large city; and it would not take many hydrogen bombs to knock out an entire nation.

The second illusion is the notion atomic and hydrogen bombs will not be used in case of war for fear of retaliation, just as poison gas was not used in the Second World War. This idea contains a number of fallacies. To begin with, history does not necessarily

repeat itself: the fact that a certain dangerous weapon was not used in one war is no sign that an even more dangerous weapon may not be used in another war, especially if it is powerful enough to achieve a possible knockout. As a surprise attack technique at the very beginning of hostilities, as a means of assuring final victory during some crucial period of the war when just a little more effort is required, or as a last desperate way to avert defeat, some nation is almost sure to use these new instruments of destruction.

At any rate, our military and political leaders, together with our scientists, are convinced this will be the case. This serves to explain the fact that some of their mightiest efforts are concentrated at this point; and the same is true of the Russians. It must also be remembered there is no international agreement prohibiting the use of atomic weapons, as was the case with gas.[54]

Finally, no less an authority than Vannevar Bush assures us there were good tactical reasons why gas was not used during the Second World War. First of all, while the First World War involved trench warfare to a great extent with large concentrations of troops which made it an unusually effective weapon, this was not true of the Second. Then in the second place, while the slow, low flying planes of the First served as excellent means of distribution, the contrary was the case during the Second with its faster aircraft. Nor would it have proved profitable to revert to the old-fashioned planes to distribute the gas; for they would have become easy targets for the expert gunners with their superior weapons. Consequently, planes dropped the more effective blockbusters and incendiary bombs.[55]

Thus the probability the new methods of warfare will be used to the hilt remains so great it must be taken for granted. Often, in fact, illusions such as those which have been considered are little more than subterfuges, either to defend war against the charge of utter irrationality, or as vain attempts to escape the grim realities of the present situation. At any rate, the human costs of war are so monstrous due to our mass weapons that the mind is overwhelmed with apprehension. One of the writer's friends, a physicist, hopes there are intelligent beings on some other planet to insure a measure of reason in the universe, since the denizens of old Mother Earth seem to have lost their sanity.

(4) *The Moral and Spiritual Costs*

The worst thing about war, however, is not that it means death for many. We all have to die, and death by means of atom or hydrogen bombs might not be so bad, that is, provided one is lucky enough to be near the center of the blast. The real sufferers are those who are doomed to die an agonizing death from burns and the effects of gamma rays; some are still slowly dying in Japan.

Yet the greatest costs of war are not physical at all, but moral and spiritual: what it does to the minds and souls of man in debasing them so that no crime seems really evil or inhuman. Nor must it be forgotten that during wartime, not only the soldiers at the front, but the masses at home in all the belligerent countries (who must work and pay taxes so that the armies can keep murdering), are subject to this brutalizing process.

A war may indeed begin, as the First World War did, in a great outburst of what appears to be genuine moral vigor centered about some popular slogan, as, for example, here in America, "Make the world safe for democracy." Still, with the masses and their leaders wartime morality has only one primary object: the defeat of the enemy, and usually every and all means are sanctioned. In other words, wartime morality even at its best tends to operate only within the narrow limitations of one's own country and its allies. It is always in danger of losing all the universality and comprehensiveness which was nailed down as the first principle of an adequate philosophy of peace. War thus signifies a reversion to jungle tribalism.

Moreover, as the brutal conflict drags on there appears a general weakening of the moral fiber all along the line: crimes of violence, sexual offenses, drunkenness, and license become the order of the day. One is reminded of young girls giving the use of their tender bodies to soldiers seemingly as an act of patriotic duty; and it brings to the thoughtful mind ghastly memories of temple prostitution which it took civilization and high religion so long to abolish. Worse yet, after the long killing spree ends, and whether it ends in victory or defeat, there is one common result for all nations—a moral debacle.

All the oustanding teachers of mankind from Socrates to Jesus of Nazareth have emphasized truthfulness; but war as much as the traditional Devil is the father of lies and liars. Some of the best illustrations of this fact are found in an interesting little book by Arthur Ponsonby which appeared about ten years after the First World War, and exposed the falsehoods used by the propaganda agencies of the various nations to incite men to hate, pay, and fight. One of the most popular was entitled "The Criminal Kaiser," portraying the German Emperor as solely responsible for the war. Ponsonby even tells of seeing a picture of Wilhelm on a poster, the face composed of corpses and with streams of blood coming out of the mouth.[56]

Similarly, it was fashionable during the Second World War to blame Hitler, Mussolini, and Tojo, these three "international gangsters," as solely responsible for the war. One cannot forget seeing their monstrous shapes, as conceived by our American propagandists, adorning almost every Boston subway. Worse yet, the people of the enemy countries were often represented as out-and-out barbarians unworthy of any sympathy or understanding. This was the sentiment which laid the basis for the stupidity of demanding unconditional surrender that only served to prolong the war. No doubt Hitler, neurotic and misanthrope that he was, must bear the major responsibility for such atrocities as the endeavor to destroy the Jews and the Poles; but the German people as a whole can no more be blamed for all his crimes than all Americans can be blamed for the dropping of the bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Of course, the present tendency is to whitewash the Germans and Japanese as potential allies while blackening the Russians, our former allies. They reciprocate with some expert vituperation of their own, an art in which they hold the world's record.

The worst thing about propaganda is that it whips men's passions to a deadly hatred; for men rarely fight effectively until they begin to hate. Every professional propagandist knows this; and he also knows that the enemy must be dehumanized, represented as monstrous brutes. During both World Wars, even in democratic America, this hatred assumed tremendous proportions and often resulted in suspicions and even outright persecutions. This writer knows of a Methodist minister, a conscientious objector, who, hav-

ing the misfortune of being of German ancestry, came close to being mobbed and tarred and feathered during the Second World War. This in spite of the fact that among his ancestors were leaders in the Revolution of 1848, which would have meant a democratic Germany had it succeeded.

There is the story of the cultured American lady, who, on being asked what ought to be done to the Germans when they surrendered, replied without hesitation: "Drive them all into a narrow neck of land, let the North Sea in on them, and drown them like rats!" When asked what Biblical authority she had for such a policy, she answered: "Let justice flow down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream." Such nonsense provokes nothing more than a laugh now; but this kind of attitude is in the saddle during wartime, and it spells stark tragedy: "Woe unto the vanquished!"

One of the greatest blots on our national honor is the treatment of the Japanese within our own borders, many of whom were American citizens. The fear, prejudice, and hate which war produces drives men to all kinds of crimes. Even Hitler did not do his worst until America's entrance into the war and his fear of ultimate defeat brought out every trace of the brute in him. If we want to abolish these horrid by-products of war, we must abolish war.

The worst thing about war is that it forces men to kill, not just once but again and again on a mass production basis. For armies act according to the doctrine of military necessity; and today there is little honor left in war, and certainly no glory. Can there be anything honorable or glorious about men sailing high above a city and dropping incendiary bombs, blockbusters, or, worse yet, disease germs, atomic bombs, or hydrogen bombs on the helpless population below? Could demons devise anything more horribly wicked? The modern habit of bombing cities is the last word in atrocity. It is far worse than anything the beasts of the jungle are capable of doing. To beat out one's fellow's brains with a club, to disembowel him with sword or bayonet, or to send a bullet through his pulsing heart is bad enough; but to rain death, speakless horror and misery on a whole city composed of women, tender babes, and the helpless aged is barbarous beyond words. Thus, whatever the

Russians and Americans may think, their greatest common enemy is WAR.

> In comparison with the Third World War all other calamities become lesser evils—lesser in death, destruction, suffering; lesser in disastrous vital, mental, moral, and sociocultural consequences. Regardless of who is the nominal victor, at least 100,000,000 human beings will perish. . . . Disease and epidemics will sweep over the whole planet. Insanity will be rampant. . . . Demoralization will be superbestial. The complete moral bankruptcy will be glaring. . . . All humanity will have to participate in the tragic dilemma: to either kill millions of innocent victims in vain, or be wantonly killed among millions of guiltless persons. Neither children nor women, neither the old nor the sick will be spared. All freedoms will disappear. All governments will become tyrannical and dictatorial. . . . The highest forms of human culture will crumble, and most of the best social institutions collapse. Crushed, degenerated, and demoralized *homo sapiens* will return to the caves from which he emerged at the dawn of history and will rove amidst the shambles of his previous civilization and glory. If his creative history is not ended entirely, it will be set back by centuries.[57]

NOTES

1 Arnold J. Toynbee, *Civilization on Trial,* p. 22. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1948). Used by permission.

2 From *The Communist Manifesto* by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, in Albert R. Chandler, *The Clash of Political Ideals,* p. 180. (Rev. ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1949). Used by permission.

3 For Russian diplomatic behavior, see Byrnes, *Speaking Frankly*; and Smith, *My Three Years in Moscow.*

4 Pitirim A. Sorokin, "Nine Theses on War and Peace" in Paul Newton Poling (ed.), *God and the Nations,* p. 110. (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1950). Used by permission.

5 Howard K. Smith, *The State of Europe,* p. 45. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1949). Used by permission.

6 Smith, *op. cit.,* pp. 45-46; see also Bailey, *America Faces Russia,* pp. 241-43.

7 See Beard, *A Basic History of the United States,* p. 436. The vast power of the President and its dangers is well stated in Beard, *President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War 1941.*

8 Smith, *op. cit.,* pp. 46, 58.

9 *Ibid.,* p. 56.

10 For an able presentation of both views by an American who knows Russia well, see Eddy, *God in History,* pp. 173-95; see also Somerville, *Soviet Philosophy,* and *The Philosophy of Peace.*

11 For a brilliant criticism of American foreign policy, see Lippman, *The Cold War.* Interestingly enough, this little book was written before the Korean War.

12 See his *Modern Man Is Obsolete,* p. 12. Along with Bradley, *No Place to Hide,* Hersey, *Hiroshima,* and Lapp, *The New Force,* this is a little book every American should read. For publishers, see the Bibliography.

13 As reported in the Press.

14 See Benns, *Europe Since 1914,* p. 106, and notes 5 and 6.

15 Albery, "The Cost of Wars," in *Political Science Quarterly,* June, 1952, p. 270.

16 *Ibid.,* p. 271.

17 Smith, *op. cit.,* p. 12.

18 See the statement sent out by the American Friends Service Committee, based on statistics from the *International Review of Diplomatic and Political Science,* Geneva.

19 *The World Almanac 1952,* pp. 64-65.

20 See *The New York Times,* June 28, 1953, pp. 1, 25; and *The Detroit Free Press,* July 3, 1953, p. 1.

21 *The World Almanac 1953,* p. 747.

22 See Text of "State-of-the-Union Message" in *The Detroit Free Press,* Feb. 3, 1953, p. 8. According to more recent reports, it has risen very close to the $275,000,000,000 limit set by Congress.

23 *The New York Times,* June 28, 1953, p. 1.

24 "Justice Douglas Appeals for Rebirth of Freedom," keynote address at the Philadelphia Bulletin Forum, March 3, 1952. Reprinted by the American Friends Service Committee and used by their permission.

25 See Wright, *A Study of War,* Vol. I, pp. 242-43, 656-57.

26 *Ibid.,* p. 244, note 67.

27 Benns, *op. cit.,* p. 106.

28 Wright, *op. cit.,* p. 245.

29 Gunther, *Behind the Curtain,* pp. 251-65.

30 See *The World Almanac 1952,* p. 240.

31 Smith, *op. cit.,* p. 13.

32 Gunther, *op. cit.,* pp. 265, 267.

33 See *The United States Strategic Bombing Survey: The Effects of Atomic Bombs on Health and Medical Services in Hiroshima and Nagasaki,* p. 57.

34 See Posin, *I Have Been to the Village,* pp. 108-10. This little book is recommended by Dr. Albert Einstein.

35 David Bradley, *No Place to Hide,* p. 165. (Boston: Little, Brown & Company and the Atlantic Monthly Press, 1949). Used by permission.

36 See Lapp, *op. cit.,* pp. 73-78.

37 *U. S. Scientific Laboratory, The Effects of Atomic Weapons,* pp. 211-19.

38 See Eliot, "The Job Ahead for Air Power," *The Magazine of American Affairs,* April 1952, pp. 33-34.

39 To visualize what an attack might be like on a city, see Hersey, *op. cit.,* or Morrison, "If the Bomb Gets Out of Hand," in Masters & Way (eds.), *One World or None,* pp. 1-6.

40 For their views see, Masters & Way (eds.), *op. cit.*

41 See *The Detroit Free Press,* March 16, 1953, pp. 1-2.

42 See *The New York Times,* May 2, 1953, p. 1.

43 Reprinted from *Modern Arms and Free Men,* p. 105 by permission of Simon and Schuster, Publishers. Copyright, 1949, by Trustees of the Vannevar Bush Trust.

44 Dr. Chisholm's view was reported in the Press; see *The Grand Forks Herald,* Sept. 10, 1949, p. 1. For more conservative views, see Bush, *op. cit.,* pp. 138-40, 142-43, 145-51; and the Official U. S. Government Booklet, "What You Should Know About Biological Warfare."

45 See *The World Almanac 1953,* p. 299.

46 See *Public Affairs Abstracts,* May, 1950, No. 9-3 (New Series).

47 For views of Einstein and Urey, see *Public Affairs Abstracts,* May, 1950, No. 9-1 (New Series).

48 Lapp, *op. cit.,* pp. 86-97; also Alsop and Lapp, "The Inside Story of Our First Hydrogen Bomb," *The Saturday Evening Post,* Oct. 25, 1952, pp. 29, 150-54. Lapp's prophecy that Russia would soon have the bomb has, of course, been fulfilled.

49 See especially "A Message to Intellectuals" in Einstein, *Out of My Later Years,* pp. 152-55.

50 Reprinted from *Modern Arms and Free Men,* pp. 126, 127 by permission of Simon and Schuster, Publishers. Copyright, 1949, by Trustees of the Vannevar Bush Trust.

51 See "The Hidden Struggle for the H-Bomb," in *Fortune,* May, 1953, pp. 109-10, 230.

52 See *The Detroit Free Press,* March 16, 1953, pp. 1-2. It is interesting to note that Vannevar Bush also played the part of a consultant to this group.

53 See Posin, *op. cit.,* pp. 112-13.

54 For the Gas Protocol, see Chambers-Harris-Bayley, *This Age of Conflict,* p. 145.

55 See Bush, *op. cit.,* pp. 118-19, 111-12, 140.

56 See his *Falsehood in War-time,* p. 75.

57 Pitirim A. Sorokin, "Nine Theses on War and Peace," in Paul Newton Poling (ed.), *God and the Nations,* pp. 108-109. (Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1950). Used by permission.

CHAPTER FIVE

A Synoptic Approach to Peace

It is easy to describe the effects of war and to condemn it as the greatest of all evils; but this is not enough. A physician is not satisfied with an account of the symptoms of a new disease and the realization that it is dangerous. This only serves to challenge him not only to find the cause or causes but also the remedy or remedies that will cure the patient. In short, the chief purpose of this present chapter is to discover the causes of war and to see what can be done by way of a cure.

1. THE NEED OF A SYNOPTIC APPROACH

In dealing with social evils such as war, the great danger is oversimplification. Men have advanced all kinds of theories as to the causes of conflict between nations, most of which contain some trace of truth. The chief difficulty, however, has been the tendency to oversimplify the matter by attempting to reduce the causes of such a complex phenomenon to one or, at best, a few factors. Yet, if modern scholarship has shown anything, it has made it clear that, unlike the struggles of animals or of primitive man, the origins and sources of modern warfare are exceedingly complex.[1]

One of the common fallacies, especially during wartime, is to accept what Dr. Charles A. Beard has called "the Devil Theory of war." The evil thing known as war is conceived as always the work of a small malicious group out of a desire for profits or from even more sinister motives.[2] This group may consist of the leader of the enemy and his subordinates (the Kaiser and the Prussian militarists during the First World War, Hitler and his gangsters during the Second), the munition makers, the international bankers, the beastly Communists (if one listens to Washington), or the dollar-hungry capitalists (if one listens to Moscow). Remove these

cankers and all will be rosy. In other words, the way to peace is very simple.

There is, of course, a certain amount of truth in this theory. Wars do not happen without men, and there can be no doubt but that certain groups or even individuals can wield a decisive influence for war as well as for peace. Yet this by no means proves that one individual, group, or nation is solely responsible. Fay has shown not only the Kaiser but others from the opposite camp, such men as Izvolski, Poincaré, and even the British Foreign Secretary, Sir Edward Grey, have at one time or another been blamed for the First World War.[3] This plainly shows that the Devil Theory rests largely on prejudice. Moreover, it is widely accepted since it is easy to understand and since it serves the needs of propaganda well. The deplorable thing is that it tends to obscure the real causes and issues involved, thus making a rational peace after a long, bitter conflict all but impossible.

There was a time when little attention was given to the economic causes. It was left to the Communists and other left wing groups to emphasize their real significance; and they have done this so well that many have fastened on these factors to the virtual exclusion of others equally significant. There is also the Marxian fallacy that once capitalism with its profit motive and the struggle for markets is eliminated, peace is assured. The existence of other war-producing factors is forgotten. Furthermore, it is clear that while Communism, unlike Nazism and Fascism, does not necessarily glorify war, still it introduces elements which are hardly conducive to peace; for example, the doctrine of revolutions and the fear produced by its hatemongering propaganda.

Today there are also groups among the intelligentsia who look upon nationalism and the international chaos as virtually the sole cause of war. All that is necessary to insure perpetual peace is to establish a world government. Certainly this view contains a large measure of truth, but the danger is twofold: the neglect of other war-producing elements, and the almost utopian belief on the part of some that world government can be established quickly as the panacea for all human ills. There are extremists who are ready to scrap the United Nations and to start afresh from the ground up erecting a world government; and if necessary they

are willing to exclude Russia and her satellites. This kind of procedure would result in the destruction of the United Nations and the creation in its place of a regional organization such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. In other words, it would split the world into two hostile camps and thus make the descent of war nothing short of inevitable.

While those who seek peace through world government tend to overemphasize the means toward peace in terms of legal and political machinery, others go to the opposite extreme with little or no regard for means. They insist peace is far more than a mere external thing; it can only come as the hearts and minds of men are changed—there must be moral and spiritual rebirth. This writer would be the last to deny the truth in this view; and in his discussion of an adequate philosophy as over against the inadequate and false philosophies he has given full recognition to this truth. Still the emphasis on right attitudes and motives and the need of inner change are far from the whole truth; the advocates of moral and spiritual rebirth forget how important effective means can be.[4] Often, in fact, the best intentions are shattered and men possessed by the highest motives and ideals become discouraged and even cynical simply because the hopes for which they freely spent themselves could not be realized due to lack of effective means. On the other hand, the machinery will not run without the moral and spiritual dynamic radiating from the lives and souls of sincerely concerned men and women. So it becomes a case, not of one or the other, but rather of both together.[5]

There are many other simple solutions, as many, in fact, as there are brands of patent medicines. Some hold that birth control is the only solution. The author once had a student who was very much interested in the effects of climate and weather as causes of war. No doubt climate and weather, together with many other environmental factors, do have a decided effect; but the great danger is always to regard them as the sole factors to the exclusion of others even more significant. This overemphasis on environmental and other impersonal forces is really conducive to fatalism: men may become convinced the final arbiters are not human wills spurred on by the Divine Imperative and joined in cooperative efforts, but blind, impersonal factors. Consequently, it is easy to

return to the old view that war is as inevitable and natural as the return of bad weather.

It is evident, then, that if we are to find the way to peace, the danger of fastening on one cause and its remedy must be avoided. The way to peace is synoptic: all the significant operating causes must be seen together in relationship. Of course, it must be granted that in any particular conflict some are more important than others: the ideological and religious along with the political during the Thirty Years' War; and economic nationalism together with militarism in the two World Wars. Our task, then, is twofold: first, to distinguish the basic, fundamental causes which tend to lie at the bottom of all modern wars, and second, special consideration of those causes which are especially at work in the present conflict between East and West. However, before this can be done some attention must be given to an important distinction which most historians and political scientists are inclined to make.

2. IMMEDIATE VERSUS BASIC CAUSES OF WAR

The immediate causes of war are those conditions, situations, and incidents which precede the beginning of actual hostilities by serving to provoke the belligerents to the point where, casting reason aside, they madly take the final plunge. Thus the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand at Sarajevo on June 28, 1914,[6] proved to be the spark which set off a whole chain of events: Berchtold's appeal for German aid; Germany's failure to effectively control the demands of her Austrian ally; Austria's ultimatum to Serbia; Poincaré's visit to Russia; Grey's failure at mediation; the Czar's final consent to general mobilization; and the other fateful events which preceded the German ultimatum to Belgium and the outbreak of hostilities in earnest. Similarly, the immediate causes of America's involvement can be traced somewhat as follows: American banks secure the right to loan money to the Allies; the American determination to sell munitions and goods to the Allies; the proclamation of the British blockade and Germany's answer in terms of unrestricted submarine warfare; the sinking of the *Lusitania*; Wilson's failure to secure a peace conference; and the other succeeding events which finally resulted in the declaration of war.[7]

A war is not inevitable until major action begins between the

belligerents. The assassination of the Austrian Archduke did not necessarily make the First World War inevitable. It did, however, set off a chain of events which brought war. If somewhere along the line this fatal chain could have been broken, it is conceivable the War might have been averted. Nevertheless, since the deeper causes would still have been operating and thus serving to produce new incidents, it might have come later. Yet, between 1900 and 1914 there were many incidents and limited wars which could have started a major conflict, but in each case, in one way or another, such a calamity was avoided, or at least did not materialize. Among these were the following: the Boer War, the Russo-Japanese War, the Moroccan Crisis following the German Emperor's speech, the Austrian annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Agadir Crisis, the Italo-Turkish War of 1911-1912, the Balkan Wars of 1912-1913, and many others which might be mentioned.

The great danger today is an incident which may serve as a spark to set off a general conflagration. The Berlin Blockade of 1949 might have been such an incident; fortunately it was settled peacefully. The Korean War was even more dangerous. In fact, when it broke out rather suddenly in 1950, this writer and some of his friends feared that this limited war might lead to a Third World War. The danger became even greater when our forces rather rashly marched to the Yalu River. Perhaps our Allies saved us from the horrors of such a devastating catastrophe.[8] Without their restraining influence, America would almost certainly have used the atomic bomb against China and thus caused Russia's entrance, since the latter is bound by treaty to come to the former's aid. If a Third World War is to be prevented, incidents must be prevented; but when they do occur, as they will, they must be handled calmly, rationally, and sanely. Sarajevo should serve as a sufficient warning.

Besides the immediate causes, there are the deeper and more fundamental causes. These lie deeper in terms of persistent attitudes, conditions, and circumstances, and are related to the immediate causes something like the disease to its symptoms. The closer and more directly an incident is related to a basic cause, the more likely will it produce war. Thus the shooting of the Archduke was so closely related to the antagonistic nationalisms of Austria-Hungary

and Serbia and the fears engendered thereby that it was exceedingly difficult to deal with the reaction which was set off. Similarly, the more directly any incident is connected with the ideological struggle between America and Russia, and the more effective it is in bringing to the surface the fears due to that struggle, the more likely it is to produce a Third World War.

Consequently, one fact is obvious: to prevent such a calamity we must deal with the deeper causes as well as with the symptoms. For if the attempt is made to take care of the symptoms only, then nothing is done to remove the seat of the disease which produces the former. In other words, unless a serious attack is made upon the basic causes of war, after having dealt successfully with many incidents, the time may come in an unguarded moment when a chain reaction may be set off which defies every endeavor at control as did Sarajevo. Attention must now be given to these deeper and more persistent causes.

3. COPING WITH THE BASIC CAUSES

(1) *The Geographic and Economic*

These two kinds of basic causes are so closely related in so many ways that it is best to treat them together. By the geographical is meant first of all the location or position of a country. This, as history shows, has had much to do with involvement in war. Thus, the little Hebrew Kingdom in Bible times, situated as it was between the powerful Egyptian Empire on the one side and the Assyrian and Babylonian on the other, was constantly drawn into other people's wars. Its Arabian cousin, on the other hand, was much more secure in its desert fastnesses. Similarly, while Germany, situated as it is between France and Russia, has been drawn into every major conflict, Switzerland and Sweden have been able to stay aloof.[9] However, it is doubtful if, in the future, location or position will have much part to play. The chances are every country will be drawn into the struggle, and none will be safe from attack, not even America, in spite of her two oceans.

Under geography must also be included such items as topography, the condition of the soil, climate, and the like. Thus in a poor country, especially if it is cold and barren, or hot and dry, the

population may soon be too large and the temptation will be to seek greener pastures. This accounts for the nomadic invasions of Europe from the steppes of Asia. Likewise, many modern lands are far too poor for their populations. There was much truth in the demand for *Lebensraum*, especially in the case of Japan; and it must not be forgotten that all three of the Axis countries belonged to the have-not nations, while Great Britain, Russia, and the United States belonged to the have nations. This must always be taken seriously as a cause of the Second World War. For have-not nations are always tempted to attack have nations when their economic plight becomes desperate. This will always be the case as long as no way is found whereby the have-nots can become haves through peaceful means. In short, if we want peace, a way must be found toward peaceful change.

Primitive man, unlike his civilized descendents, was not corrupted by the desire for luxuries. He was concerned for the most elemental needs of life: food, a few scraps of animal skin for clothing, and a rude shelter from the weather. As a result, he went to war with other groups over such relatively simple matters as the possession of certain hunting and fishing areas. Later man became imperialistic; that is, leaders succeeded in organizing powerful states by subjecting one tribe after another. Thus, in time, a powerful warrior and aristocratic class arose which fought and ruled, and was supported by slaves and tribute from conquered lands. This was the nature of ancient imperialism. The chief difference during the Middle Ages was simply the fact that the slave had now become a serf.

With the discovery of the new world, the growth of capitalism, and the coming of the machine age, modern imperialism began. The scramble for America not only brought bloody encounters with the aborigines and their eventual suppression, but it also led to conflicts between the various exploiting nations. However, as everyone knows, after the colonies on the two continents became strong enough they set up their own governments and contended for mastery with one another.

The great colonial empires, of course, were Great Britain, France, and Spain; but with the eventual decline of the latter, the former became supreme, especially England. The English fought many

wars for the extension and preservation of their Empire, and during the middle of the nineteenth century their sun stood at its zenith. Following the Napoleonic Wars, Britain stood practically unrivaled.

But this situation could not remain for long. In fact, toward the end of the century many rivals appeared. Not only must she still keep an eye on her old opponents, France and Russia, but she feared even more the young, boisterous, militaristic German nation eager for a place in the sun. Thus, one of the underlying causes of the First World War was undoubtedly economic imperialism, the struggle between Great Britain and Germany for supremacy. Unfortunately, the world was already divided up for the most part; so, if Germany really wanted an empire she would have to contend with the possessors of empire.

Imperialism was likewise one of the chief causes of the Second World War. There was Britain still desperately trying to hold on to her dissolving empire, and the same was true of France, and even the United States. The Axis countries, on the other hand, have-nots that they were, had grandiose visions of future glory; this was especially true of Japan with her slogan: "Asia for Asiatics." Moreover, the United States, having at last mastered her vast continental domain, had since the imperialistic Spanish-American War annexed colonies; and though she took no territory at the close of the First World War, yet most of Europe was in debt to her while her merchants and captains of industry roamed everywhere as though the world were their domain.

To complicate matters still further, Russia under the new regime was coming to new life, dreaming the old Czarist dreams of an outlet to the Mediterranean, and also hoping to regain some of her lost possessions. Thus like the First, the Second World War was a struggle between Leviathans, the have nations eager to hold on to what they had and even to increase it a bit if possible, and the have-nots out to gain all the traffic would bear.

Closely related to imperialism is the hunger of certain groups within every nation for gigantic profits. Foremost among these are the munition-makers, the bankers, and manufacturers;[10] and closely associated with these are the farmers, the workers, and the public at large. Everyone wants prosperity, and with our crazy, planless economic system the easiest way to continue it or to overcome the

effects of depression is to blunder into a war.[11] Then everything booms, everyone is employed, and as long as it does not affect too many people personally, little or no effort is made to stop it.[12] Most people have so easy a conscience or perhaps are so lacking in imagination that a little war, provided it does not get too big or come too close, does not worry them greatly. In fact, there are always groups in every country who are not averse to their nations becoming involved as long as it means luscious profits. There is the case of the rich Texas oil man, a leader in his church, who expressed the wish that the United States would become involved in the Second World War in order that he might sell more oil.

What can be done to cope with the geographical and economic causes of war? Here we shall deal with the problem only in a general way, leaving the matter of a more concrete and specific solution in terms of a program of action relevant to the present situation until the last chapter. Obviously, there are some things which cannot be done, as for example, shifting the geographical position of a nation or advising whole nations or large sections of their populations to emigrate. However, there are still some countries which welcome immigrants, and others should open their doors wider. The United States with its vast surpluses certainly ought to be able to take care of a larger population.

More important still, backward nations, such as China and India, must speed up the process of industrialization. They should apply science to the development of their vast potential resources on a much greater scale than they have done. Likewise, the smaller overcrowded nations must make more intensive use of the means they possess. Through cooperatives and specialization in certain high quality products to be sold on the world market, it is surprising what small countries such as Sweden and Denmark have done, though due to world conditions they are faced with new difficulties today.[13] Again, far more use must be made of experimental science. If only a fraction of the stupendous sums used to make weapons of destruction were used to harness the forces of nature, the earth could be made to blossom like the rose, and poverty could be banished within fifty or a hundred years, perhaps even sooner.

Everything possible must also be done to promote trade between nations. This means the reduction and gradual elimination of all

tariffs and other barriers to the free movement of goods. One of the chief reasons for Europe's plight is the countless number of countries, each with its own tariffs and duties. Real efforts should likewise be made for the sharing of raw materials. The Schuman Plan is certainly a step in the right direction.[14] In short, the only alternative to imperialism and cutthroat competition is a new enlightened policy of sharing and mutual cooperation. This will mean sacrifices, especially on the part of the have nations, but it will be worth the cost. For not only will it strike at one of the basic causes of war, it will also in the end help to put the world on a real, healthy basis of prosperity.[15]

In many countries there is also desperate need of land reform; the great estates must be broken up with due compensation to their owners and the land must be sold to the landless as cheaply as possible. Moreover, all nations must realize that imperialism is absolutely out of date. The time is past when the Orient could be expected to submit docilely to Western exploitation. The revolutions in China, India, Egypt, Iran, in fact, throughout Asia, and the rumblings in Africa, should serve as warnings. Yet, though the days of imperialism are over, the possibilities for trade are vast and must be encouraged in every legitimate way; that is, with the understanding that it must be carried on so as to contribute to the mutual good of all concerned. This some of the more enlightened business men are beginning to realize.

It is also encouraging to see the growing conviction of a few that the flag must not follow the dollar. Only those will continue to be welcome and will continue to make modest profits who have real regard for the interests and welfare of the people and nation to whom they are trying to sell. All but the most stupid know that, however much profit it may bring in the initial stages, a Third World War would destroy everything.[16] At the close of such a conflict the cities, factories, ships, and marts of trade would all have vanished, irretrievably lost.

Though there will always be of necessity a certain amount of healthy competition among nations, there must be limits set beyond which it must not go; and the resort to war and force must be entirely excluded. There should be many international gatherings of business men of all nations to devise codes and to establish

a sense of honor. Such groups working hand in hand with the United Nations, and especially such special organizations as the International Trade Organization, the International Bank, and the International Labor Organization, could make a real contribution to peace. The same applies to the labor associations of all the countries. It is very doubtful if there can be peace without the cooperation of these two powerful groups, business and labor.

(2) *The Biological and Psychological*

The biological causes of war are closely related both to the psychological and also to those already discussed. The two chief biological causes are undoubtedly overpopulation due to too many births (more mouths than can be fed), and another disturbing fact, the existence of so many diverse races. It has already become clear how overpopulation operates as a cause of war: it creates such pressures within a country that there will be an internal explosion, a revolution, or else an attempt at foreign expansion. The best modern example is, of course, Japan. Nor can there be any doubt but that this will become an increasing problem; from 1815 to 1914 the population of Europe alone doubled, increasing from 200,000,000 to 450,000,000.[17] The situation is even more serious in many Asian countries.

Likewise, the racial factor is becoming an increasing source of friction, especially between the white and colored peoples. Japan made a vast appeal for a time with its slogan, "Asia for Asiatics"; and today China is making a similar appeal. Even in Africa there are signs of growing resistance to white domination. The colored races no longer fear and respect the white man as they once did. At last they have realized that he is no mortal god. Memories of inhuman oppression, the success of little Japan in defeating big Russia in the Russo-Japanese War, the rise of powerful new oriental countries with a sense of destiny—all these factors serve to challenge the colored races into the belief that the future belongs to them, especially in view of their increasing numbers. This should constitute a stern warning to the white man; for if he stubbornly refuses to respect his non-white fellows, this rising tide of color may some day overwhelm him.

There are five outstanding psychological causes of war: fear and the desire for security, hate, gregariousness, lust for power, and the fascination of war. Fear and the desire for security are basic; they operate with the economic causes, and are especially evident as the dynamic forces behind all armament races. Aside from the special interests of the militarists, the munition-makers, and other groups, the chief motive in the present armament race is the Russian fear of encirclement, and the American fear of Soviet ambitions to conquer the world.

This fear and the desire for security becomes really dangerous when it reaches the paranoiac stage. There is the tendency to overthrow rational controls and to push the nations to the edge of the abyss. This was certainly true during those "hectic" weeks which followed the assassination of Franz Ferdinand; and here we see how closely immediate and basic causes are related. There is always the deadly fear on all sides that the enemy will strike first with overwhelming force and decide the issue before the other is fully aware of what has happened. If Europe in 1914 could have remained calm, perhaps the matter could have been settled peacefully. Little did the rulers realize that, like madmen, they were pulling down their own thrones. At any rate, the great danger today is that propagandists on both sides raise such tidal waves of fear and hate as to produce incidents leading to surprise attacks and total war.

For fear and hate tend to operate together as causes of war; though hate may sometimes be so great as to overwhelm whatever rational fears there may be of war itself. Moreover, it has already become clear that men fight best if they hate most. Nor can it be doubted that hate has been one of the chief factors leading to many wars during the long course of human history. This is especially true of great hatreds which have become deeply ingrained, as those between France and Germany, and Germany and the Soviet Union. The easiest way to produce war is to cause two nations to fear and hate one another. This will lead to incidents which in turn will lead to the thirst for revenge. As Jesus and many other great teachers realized long ago, if men are to live together they must replace hatred with love in terms of respect for personality and concern for the common welfare.

In itself, gregariousness is no more evil than a certain amount of rational fear and desire for security. It may function, however, as a cause of war under certain conditions. If men did not have the tendency to follow the group so blindly and to be so easily awed and cowed by its leaders to the detriment of independent rational thinking and action, it is obvious that nationalism and totalitarianism could not develop so easily and function as causes of war. Nothing is more pitiful than the sight of people blindly following their nation and its leaders, even if they are being led to the very gates of hell. Most mothers give their sons without too much protest. In short, if people were not so much like silly sheep, but exercised more independence in judgment and action, their leaders would think twice before they led them into war; they would exhaust every other means first.

Perhaps even more important is the lust for power. Behind this factor lie such legitimate desires as the concern for recognition and social approval. Yet neither individuals nor nations can take much of the wine of power without becoming intoxicated. It has maddened some men so that they lived for nothing else, led on by visions of grandeur. Thus, Alexander the Great professed to be the son of Zeus; Napoleon, whose lust for conquest was insatiable, regarded himself as a man of destiny; and Hitler apparently thought himself the Prophet of his god, Almighty Germany. It is this lust for power which often drives leaders to do such mad things as the German Dictator's attack on Russia against the advice of his generals. It is this same lust for power which is also the grain of truth in the Devil Theory of war, though no leader alone, without the right conditions and circumstances, could plunge a country into a modern war. Of course, there is such a thing as creating incidents, but even these could only lead to a fatal chain reaction due to other and more basic causes to which they can be related.

Finally, there is the psychological attraction of war. Most people are fascinated by military parades; militarism has always fed on parades; and generals seem to have a strange power over men. It is said that Russian generals during the Second World War were looked upon as virtual demigods. This same phenomenon is at work in America where it could some day lead to a military

dictatorship. Speaking of the Roman Emperor, Trajan, Gibbon warns:

> Trajan was ambitious of fame; and as long as mankind shall continue to bestow more liberal applause on their destroyers than on their benefactors, the thirst of military glory will ever be the vice of the most exalted characters.[18]

Part of the psychological attraction of war also consists in associating it with such ideals as freedom, democracy, patriotism, and even at times with religion. This arouses the most powerful feelings and gives propagandists on both sides of the conflict their golden opportunity. Again, many people tend to lead rather commonplace, humdrum, even empty lives; they have no cause. Yet when war comes with beating drums, they suddenly find themselves lifted above the ordinary, their souls become flooded; they have found a cause. Thus they join the army or sell bonds or serve on committees and feel a sense of importance, even of exaltation. Most of them do not have the broadness of vision or the ethical sensitivity to realize they are promoting something brutal, destructive, and inhuman. There was a man who felt himself thus uplifted, transfigured, and transformed when the First World War came in fury like a breaking storm; let us never forget his name —his name was Adolf Hitler!

Are we altogether helpless in the face of these biological and psychological forces? No more than in the case of the geographical and economic; there is much which can be done. Education, together with a sane policy of birth control, plus a real effort to increase production, would do much toward solving the problem of overpopulation. The question of racial conflict is also very dangerous, yet much is being done and more can and must be done to alleviate existing conditions.

What is needed above all else is cooperation on the part of men of good will of all races. They must be spurred on by the realization that continued conflict will not only mean the doom of the greatly out-numbered white race, but of all races. Both at top levels (national and international), and on local and community levels everything possible must be done to check conflict and to promote understanding. The United States and South Africa, these

two chief sinners, have a special responsibility in this vital matter. It must not be forgotten that whenever an outrage is perpetrated against colored people anywhere in our country, Communists rejoice and gleefully broadcast it throughout the length and breadth of the entire world.

As far as the first three psychological causes are concerned, the chief means of controlling them is through the establishment of right conditions. Above all else, something must be done toward creating a greater feeling of security. False propaganda by warmongers must be counteracted by an appeal to truth. There are times when the only effective way to combat an irrational fear and also blind hatred is by an appeal to a greater rational fear. Thus the irrational, paranoiac fear and hatred which the Americans and Russians have for each other must be replaced by the rational fear and hatred of their common enemy, WAR. More than this, they must be enlisted in a positive program of peace action through the United Nations. The fireman who is engaged in the constructive task of putting out the fire is hardly disturbed by the frenzied fear of the mere bystander. In the last chapter a constructive program of peace action, into which everyone can fit himself and take his place, will be proposed. Nor can the power of high religion be overestimated in counteracting fear, hate, and the drift toward totalitarianism, through its positive emphasis on faith, love, truth, and peace.

The dangerous lust for power must be exposed to the white light of world opinion wherever it appears. Besides, only the very best men should be elected to office; and everything possible must be done to prevent conditions within a nation from deteriorating to the point where dictatorship tends to become inevitable. Economic crises, war scares, more and more military control of civilian affairs together with the suppression of academic and religious freedom—all these are conducive to totalitarianism. After the horse is stolen it is too late to lock the barn.

As for the psychological attractiveness of war, at least three things can be done. First, youth must be taught the real nature of modern warfare: that it is hideous, repulsive, cruel, and destructive beyond measure. The glory must be taken from war and placed on the brow of peace. Second, men everywhere must be

taught the real causes of war and what can be done toward prevention.

The third was well expressed by the great psychologist, William James, when he insisted that there must be a "moral equivalent" of war. In other words, man must find peaceful interests and pursuits which are as attractive and thrilling as war has been. If our philosophy is correct in assuming that the true end of man is the development of all his creative capacities, then we have a clue as to what the purpose and goal of the education of the future should be:[19] it should teach men to think profoundly and to love the things of the mind; it should teach them to use mind and hand to master nature for the good of mankind, dare to attempt to tear the veil from every last mystery, including the starry spaces —here indeed is a call to high adventure; it should teach them to love and appreciate beauty in nature and in art; and above all else, it should teach them to thrill with moral passion, and to open their minds and hearts to the call of high religion, to the call of the Infinite. Besides this, there would also be a place for the development of the body through athletics placed on the highest possible level. Who knows but if the nations learned to play together and to contend manfully for the laurel crown as much and as zestfully as the Greeks of old did on the plains of Elis, this, too, would help them to forget war.

(3) *The Political*

Aristotle long ago called man the political animal. While animals have societies, he alone is the architect of states and engages in politics. Moreover, that the state is essential to man's higher life, all except anarchists would admit. Yet one of the chief causes of modern warfare is selfish nationalism, the existence of many jealous, competing states, and man's fanatical devotion to them.

Every historian and political scientist, as far as this writer knows, would agree that nationalism and the resulting world chaos was one of the basic causes of both World Wars.[20] With the vast number of nations in the world, each with its own traditions, history, prejudices, fears and hatreds, hopes and ambitions, tariff system, and armed forces, it is no wonder we have wars. Again, while individuals, even the worst, often act from the very highest

motives, nations are nearly always Machiavellian; so much so that this characteristic is taken for granted. At their worst they are little more than gigantic aggregates of selfishness and power, each trying to devour the other. The international jungle is full of these monsters. Of course, all nations have certain cherished ideals, and sometimes they forget themselves and act accordingly, but rarely. Even the much lauded Marshall Plan was motivated largely by political considerations.

Here in nationalism, then, we have our finger on one of the most obvious and certain causes of modern warfare. The tendency, especially in times of crisis, is for every nation to consult its own interests and to forget the larger interests of the community of nations. The general attitude is every country for itself and the Devil take the hindmost. It is this that makes international relations so much of a jungle where strange monsters lurk, and in which everything is permissible. Nor did the authors of the Treaty of Versailles help matters by creating so many new nations, and by vainly trying to keep Germany and Austria separate. It meant inflicting Europe with more petty countries, governments, tariff barriers, and military forces. The victors of the Second World War have even done worse with their short-sighted folly in dividing nations such as Germany and Korea. They sowed the wind and are now beginning to reap the whirlwind. In short, the winners of both wars were working against the major trends of history.

Closely related to nationalism are the systems of alliances and counter-alliances by means of which nations seek security. Yet, in the long run they produce wars. Prior to the First World War, Europe became divided into two armed camps with the British heading one, and the Germans the other. The result was that when the crisis came, Austria-Hungary, assured of the backing of her German ally, made demands which would not otherwise have been made. Serbia, in turn, was backed by Russia, and the latter, in turn, tried to make sure of England and France. As a result, when hostilities finally began, most of the countries in Europe were drawn into the bloody conflict.

Likewise, prior to the Second World War, two hostile blocs began forming with Great Britain again leading one, and Hitler's Germany the other. Thus, wherever nations begin forming oppos-

ing blocs, there is great danger of war. Such blocs not only have a bad psychological effect by increasing fear, but there is also always the danger that some nation, assured of group support, may become demanding in an uncompromising manner. Having learned little from history, Russia and the United States have been trying to play the same old sordid game. On the one hand, there is the former with her satellites, and on the other, the latter with the nations comprising the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Now, however, there are definite signs that both of these groups are unstable. More will be said concerning the significance of this fact in the next chapter.

Propaganda is also closely related to nationalism as a cause of war. Each nation, of course, puts out its own special brands deeply colored by its own particular prejudices. Some of the most clever men are employed in poisoning the very sources of information and thus distorting public opinion. Excellent samples can be found in Arthur Ponsonby's *Falsehood in War-time.*

The official propaganda agencies of the governments are ably seconded by the newspapers and radio. Fay is so greatly impressed by the evil influence of newspaper propaganda that he lists it as one of the major causes of the First World War.[21] Next to the radio, this type also played an important part as a cause of the Second World War; and one of the ominous signs of our time is the propaganda battle going on between the Voice of America and the Russian system.

There are two readings of history which are equally false. The first looks upon it as entirely or almost entirely the work of outstanding men. This is certainly false since it has become evident that many conditions and circumstances, as well as the mass of human beings, all have a part to play in the drama. The other theory makes history little more than the clash of blind, impersonal forces. Men are degraded to the role of mere puppets. This view is so obviously contrary to facts that it may likewise be dismissed as false. Since men are self-conscious and reflective, since they can discriminate and make choices, and since they seem to be able to act decisively, it is reasonable to suppose that they play a creative role in really determining the course of history.[22]

It seems certain, then, that men, both as individuals and as groups, can really become causes of war. The assassin who slew the Archduke, the Austrian officials who insisted on sending the ultimatum to Serbia, the Czar who finally gave his permission to mobilize the Russian armies, these and many others, whether they were fully conscious of the fact or not, became causes of the First World War. The same might be said of Hitler relative to the Second and of many others besides. It might also be said of President Roosevelt and many others as far as America's entrance is concerned.[23] We will not argue the point whether these are to be regarded as immediate or basic causes. Suffice it to say that without the personality factor there would be no wars; nor would there be any history. Thus, both in war and in peace, and in all the processes of history, the human factor is paramount.

What can be done about the political causes of war? There is little difficulty about what ought to be done; but in applying the remedy, there is the rub. The only answer to nationalism and the international chaos is a strong United Nations. The present jungle of international relations must be put under law. Nationalism is archaic in a world which needs unity so desperately. Nothing less than eventual world government must be the goal. In this the World Federalists are absolutely right; though it will not come as quickly as some of them think. This is the goal toward which we must increasingly move, but in the meantime making the best of the United Nations as it is at any time. World order and world government are also the answer to the problem of entangling alliances. The former, once it is established, can give the security which the latter can never give. At the same time while working for world government, every effort must be made to bring about understanding between East and West so that the hostile blocs, already badly shaken, will wither away.

Finally, every effort must be made toward securing the best and most capable men for office. In time of storm all may in some crucial moment depend upon the captain at the helm. An incapable man in charge may mean shipwreck. America's great difficulty is securing outstanding men; there are too many mediocre, second rate men in responsible positions. One reason for this is that we

do not respect experts; they are crucified because with their superior knowledge they disdain our petty prejudices.

Since the American President has such vast powers, even to committing the nation to war under certain conditions, it behooves us to see that only the most capable are elected to this high office. Long ago Plato insisted that until the best rule, mankind will be subject to endless preventable miseries.[24] Democracy does not mean that anyone and everyone is fit to govern; it does not mean mediocrity. On the contrary, it signifies at its best an enlightened citizenship choosing none but the most able.

(4) *The Militaristic*

Militarism usually develops out of a sense of insecurity and fear and is closely related to nationalism and imperialism. It consists of four primary elements: an attitude or state of mind which is closely related to the psychological causes of war; a feverish preparation for a possible conflict; the development of a military caste; and a kind of nationalistic cult.

The state of mind is essentially that of an exponent of the materialistic philosophies of power discussed in the first chapter. The militarist is a pessimist concerning human nature and peaceful attempts to settle disputes; he relies largely on force, rather than on persuasion and the pressure of public opinion. Nor is he happy unless his country is exerting every effort to build a large military force, larger than those possessed by potential foes. In fact, both from honest conviction and from self-interest he does not hesitate to appeal to fear and even hate to keep the process going and, if at all possible, to speed it up.

Any nation which thus becomes indoctrinated and conditioned soon develops a powerful military caste that grows in power until the way to totalitarianism and war becomes easy. The cult is centered about the nation, its military traditions, its heroes, its symbols such as flags, and its power. With its military trappings of uniforms, flags, swords, decorations, parades, handsome youths and fair maidens, and stirring songs it tends to create a martial spirit together with a very unrealistic view of war.

Militarism is exceedingly dangerous, and left unchecked makes a nation totalitarian and warlike. This leads to war after war,

bringing eventual exhaustion and destruction.[25] Assyria, Rome, and Sparta are excellent examples from the ancient world, and France, Germany, and Japan from the modern. Nor can there be any doubt that militarism is one of the chief causes of modern wars. In his list of the chief causes of the First World War, Fay lists it second.[26] It was also one of the major causes of the last great War. Reports from Americans traveling on the continent just prior to the beginning of hostilities indicate that Europe seemed one vast armed camp. The Axis countries certainly did everything possible to nurture the cult of militarism, provoking their opponents to follow their example.

The most perilous aspect of militarism is the armament race. Speaking of conditions just before the outbreak of the First World War, Fay goes so far as to say:

> Armaments were alleged to be for defense and in the interests of peace, according to the fallacious maxim, *si vis pacem, para bellum.* They were intended to produce a sense of security. That was the argument used in getting from legislatures the necessary grants of money. What they really did produce was universal suspicion, fear, and hatred between nations. If one country increased its army, built strategic railways, and constructed new battleships, its fearful neighbors were straightway frightened into doing likewise. So the mad competition in armaments went on in a vicious circle.[27]

This sounds strangely contemporary. Today, in fact, the world is engaged in the most costly and most hazardous armament race of all times. Yet, there is no security in sight; if the truth were told, there is an increasing insecurity.[28]

Moreover, Wright has shown that a direct relationship exists between armament races and war.[29] While there is no blind, inexorable Fate which necessarily makes history repeat itself, yet it does tend to repeat itself in certain general and very significant ways. Since armament races increase fear and insecurity, and also the lust for power, and since there is an armament race on today between the two most powerful nations on earth which makes all previous ones pale into comparative insignificance, the time has come for all sane men of good will who love peace to stop this madness before it reaches the place of no return. Everything pos-

sible must be done to secure a positive program of progressive disarmament, and some rational system of atomic energy control. More will be said concerning these vital problems in the final chapter.[30]

(5) *The Historical*

By the historical as used here, two things are implied: the warlike traditions of a race or nation, and its memories of past grievances. The first is directly related to the cult of militarism, including, as it does, the commemoration of the slain in battle and the deeds of great heroes. Insofar as the military virtues are praised and the young are impressed with the renown and public recognition given to warriors as over against the heroes of peace, there can be no doubt of its conduciveness to war. One reason why it is so difficult to strike at war effectively is that in the popular mind it has become associated with patriotism and is therefore regarded sentimentally rather than rationally.

As to the second, everyone knows how old prejudices and the memory of old wrongs serve to produce war. The memory of the first Napoleon's treatment of Germany was certainly a factor in provoking the Franco-Prussian War. Similarly, Prussia's brutal treatment of France at the close of the brief conflict caused the latter to nurse her grievances and to look for an opportunity for revenge: thus it functioned as a cause of the First World War and the vindictive Treaty of Versailles. The vicious circle begun by Napoleon helped produce the Nazis in a nation deeply hurt and angered by the injustices of the Treaty of Versailles; and Hitler's inhumanities, in turn, led to the revengeful and even stupid treatment of Germany at the close of the Second World War which may yet serve as dragon's teeth from which a future conflict may spring.

Above all else men, and especially Europeans, must be taught to forget. Perhaps a few skillful cartoonists (acting as peace propagandists) might help by showing them how ridiculous it is to blindly allow one's self and future generations to be hampered and hindered by grudges so old they have become putrid. More seriously, a real program of peace education is needed both for youth and adults. It must strip war of its glory and also explore

past grievances in terms of their total setting, thus preparing the way for understanding. The resources of religion must likewise be enlisted to teach them to forgive and forget. People must be shown that, unless they are willing to forgive and forget, these old grudges will rise up like ghosts and destroy them.

At any rate, it is high time all nations, including Russia and the United States, bury the hatchet. In order to facilitate this process, everything must be done to right past wrongs, and new ones in terms of incidents must be prevented, or, having occurred, must be dealt with calmly, rationally, constructively. The whites, especially, must show more regard for the colored races. If this is not done, the memories of the old imperialism and the old oppressions (which still rankle in the Oriental mind) will rise up and hang both groups by the same rope.

(6) *The Ideological*

The term ideological as used here signifies both the different thought patterns of the various nations and cultures and the dominant and influential philosophies in the world today. The basic cultural patterns of a people are usually shaped and molded by the prevailing religion. Thus, the dominant pattern in China until recently was the Confucian. Great as this tradition is in certain respects, for China it meant the backward look; for a long time she was content to live her own life and tried to shut out the rest of the world. Consequently, there were many violent clashes and even wars between the static, conservative Chinese state and the dynamic, enterprising, scientific West.

Likewise, the life of Japan was molded largely by its intensely nationalistic and militaristic religion, Shintoism. After a period of decline, it revived during the nineteenth century and provided the dynamic force behind the fanatical zeal of the enterprising Japanese militarists and imperialists. Islam also has had a basis for imperialistic expansion in its doctrine of the Holy War; and, similarly, ancient Zoroastrianism and the ancient Hebrew religion were aggressive in the military sense.

Christianity, on the other hand, as expounded by Jesus, was essentially pacifistic. Yet, in the process of accommodating itself to its new role as the official state religion which began with the

Emperor Constantine, it managed to find a basis for blessing wars in the old Hebrew mores as found in certain parts of the Old Testament. In the long struggle with Islam (a struggle once even more fanatical than the present conflict between Americanism and Communism), it even waged wars of its own. Buddhism is also basically pacifistic, but, like Christianity, has tended to accommodate itself to the warlike customs of the tribes and nations among which it spread.

Thus the great religions, which have shaped the patterns of the various cultures in many remarkable ways, have helped more often than not to sanctify militarism. More than this, they themselves have become belligerent at times and waged wars. The chief cause of the Crusades was certainly religious; and the same thing was true of the bloody Thirty Years' War which was fought between the followers of the humble Nazarene. Moreover, one of the major causes of the difficulties between the Hindus and the Moslems is undoubtedly religious. Nevertheless, one of the hopeful signs of our day is the decreasing antagonism among religions, and the almost complete elimination of the religious factor as a cause of war.[31]

Today the chief sources of danger from the ideological angle are the materialistic philosophies of power. In fact, it is not too much to say that these constitute the basic cause of the present conflict between East and West with the other significant causes operating as aspects of this fundamental element. To meet the challenge of these systems three things are necessary: first, these philosophies must be criticized and reduced to the absurd (as was attempted in Chapter I); second, these and other dangerous systems must be replaced by a more adequate and constructive system (as was attempted in Chapter III); and third, there must be found an adequate strategy capable of dealing positively and realistically with the causes of war (having laid the foundations in previous chapters, this shall be the task of the final chapter).

(7) *Ignorance*

Along with the many causes of war which have been considered, one other very obvious cause deserves brief discussion: sheer ignorance. Most people know little or nothing about the real origins

of war. History has meant little more to them than dates, generals, battles, and the rearrangement and deepening of their particular brand of national prejudice. As a result they tend to adopt the Devil Theory of war as preached by their propagandists, and there thinking stops. This is deplorable since it makes the existence of an enlightened public opinion, so necessary to effective peace action, virtually impossible. In our endeavors for peace the need of an enlightened public opinion is so imperative that it cannot be overemphasized.

The great challenge of the future, then, is a program of real peace education beginning with the children but also including adults. The fallacies of the old Devil Theory must be exposed; and in its place emphasis must be given to the synoptic approach with the attempt to understand the real causes of war and what can be done about them. It is safe to say that if men knew the basic origins of war, they would be less inclined to fight.

NOTES

1 Careful studies such as Wright's two volumes, *A Study of War,* Bernard's *War and Its Causes,* and Fay's two volumes, *The Origins of the World War,* serve to convince the student how complex the causes really are and the necessity of investigation.

2 See *The Devil Theory of War,* especially pp. 18-29.

3 See Fay, *op. cit.,* Vol. I, p. 2.

4 This is especially true of some absolute pacifists who think the only way to stop war is to convert the world to their kind of pacifism, but who will not lift a finger to further the United Nations.

5 One of the best statements of the importance of inner attitudes is in Maurer, *Collision of East and West,* pp. 3-13.

6 For a graphic description of the event, see Fay, *op. cit.,* Vol. II, pp. 43-52, 121-26.

7 See Beard, *op. cit.,* pp. 30 ff.; and also Beard, *A Basic History of the United States,* pp. 428-32.

8 The reader will recall Truman's remarks concerning the possible use of the atomic bomb in Korea which brought Attlee to Washington. This led Morgan Phillips, Secretary of the British Labor Party, to assert that the latter had averted a Third World War; see *The Economist,* Oct. 13, 1951, p. 841. The great danger is that the fitful truce in Korea may fail resulting in a second war which may really be the prelude to Armageddon.

9 Sweden's success in staying out of war is perhaps even more due to the ability of her people to profit by past experience, and their determination and will to peace. See Hinshaw, *Sweden: Champion of Peace.*

10 On the part these groups played in getting the United States into the First World War, see Beard, *The Devil Theory of War,* pp. 30-106. These groups do not really want war but they are willing to do certain things which tend to lead to war; usually their motives are also partly idealistic.

11 Yet war never solves the basic problem; see Sternberg, *The Coming Crisis.*

12 On the increase of the money supply due to the Korean War, see *U. S. News & World Report,* Aug. 8, 1952, p. 68.

13 On what Sweden has accomplished, see Childs, *Sweden: The Middle Way*; on recent developments, see Hinshaw, *op. cit.*

14 On this plan, see Harrison, *This Age of Global Strife,* p. 424.

15 This would also mean that the Panama Canal, the Suez Canal, and other waterways now controlled by individual nations would have to be internationalized with due compensation to present owners.

16 For an enlightened business leader's views concerning war and its prevention, see Holliday, "Our Final Choice," in *The Reader's Digest,* Jan., 1948.

17 See Chambers-Harris-Bayley, *This Age of Conflict,* p. 2.

18 Edward Gibbon, *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,* Vol. I, p. 6. (New York: Random House, Inc., n.d.). Used by permission.

19 Perhaps nothing is more important than education in this matter of peace; but modern education, like modern philosophy and religion, has to a great extent lost its way; especially when it comes to this all-important matter of goals. This writer has a book in preparation on the subject.

20 Compare the following: Benns, *op. cit.,* pp. 6-7; Bernard, *op. cit.,* pp. 378-80; Fay, *op. cit.,* Vol. I, p. 44; and Wright, *op. cit.,* Vol. II, pp. 987-1011.

21 See *op. cit.,* Vol. I, pp. 47-49.

22 For an interesting example of how men can influence the course of history, see Toynbee, *Civilization on Trial,* pp. 31-34.

23 See Beard, *President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War 1941.*

24 See *The Republic,* Book V, 473, p. 174.

25 On this point, see Toynbee, *War and Civilization.* This is really the thesis of the whole book.

26 Fay, *op. cit.,* Vol. I, pp. 38-44.

27 Sidney Bradshaw Fay, *The Origins of the World War,* Vol. I, p. 39 (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928). Used by permission.

28 Note the title of an article by Ernest K. Lindley, "More Bombs, Less Security," *Newsweek,* May 5, 1952, p. 30.

29 Wright, *op. cit.,* Vol. II, pp. 690-91, 813, 1268.

30 On the problem of armaments and what needs to be done, Swombley, *The Road to War,* is helpful.

31 One of the best sources of information concerning the great religions is Noss, *Man's Religions*; for present conditions, see Braden, *War, Communism and World Religions.*

CHAPTER SIX

Signs of Hope

When one contemplates the many causes of war, the difficulty in dealing with them effectively, together with the many failures in man's attempt to achieve a lasting peace, the natural tendency is to yield to despair, to adopt a fatalistic attitude. Yet it must be remembered that fatalism and despair offer no promise of creative possibilities, but represent a final paralysis of hopeful endeavor. Worse yet, it cannot be made emphatic enough that fatalism itself becomes a cause helping to make inevitable the very calamity which is feared.

Again, all is by no means as hopeless as it may seem at first glance. When one ceases staring at his feet and dares to raise his eyes to the horizon, he cannot but find some signs of encouragement. Thus, before the final chapter on strategy and suggestions for definite action, we shall lift our eyes to the horizon.

1. THE HOPE OF HOPELESSNESS

However great man's despair may be as he descends into the valley of despondency, after having struck bottom, there is the natural tendency for his spirits to rise again due to many impulses. Among these is the desire for life itself as something precious, not only his own life but also the lives of all he loves, and in the case of the great idealists and humanitarians this may include all mankind. Then there comes the saving thought that perhaps after all he was too hasty in his despair; the time has come to forget past disappointments and defeats and to once more, like Habakkuk the Prophet, take a stand on the watchtower. So, like Rustum, who has been sulking in his tent, he pulls himself together, ready once more for the fray, and with a greater wisdom. Something of this

nature is taking place among the most thoughtful of all nations, and it has tremendous possibilities.

There are also many uneasy stirrings among the masses. For the first time many of them are beginning to understand what the thoughtful have been trying to tell them: that another war, instead of being an exciting adventure with opportunities for both glory and profits, will destroy all they hold dear. Of course, the people of Europe have had first hand experience; they know, as most Americans do not, that war is HELL.

The trouble with the ordinary thoughtless American has been his smug complacency. Till only yesterday war seemed faraway, not unlike the horror story in a magazine which is read with considerable excitement but soon forgotten in the whirl of other things. In fact, when he was first told of the dangers of atomic warfare from which his two oceans could not afford protection, he became somewhat irritated, wondering why anyone should disturb him in his money-making and his pleasure-seeking. But, no matter how hard one may try, he cannot shut out reality forever unless he is willing to try insanity as a possible escape. At any rate, today the sleeper, even in America, is troubled with nightmares. Let us hope and pray that tomorrow he may awake, ready for that creative response which is necessary for salvation.

In short, the very dangers which the atomic age inspires are a source of hope. They may awaken the poor human animal in time to save himself; and let us not forget that from the very mouth of Hell, Christian saw a way leading to the gates of Heaven.

2. AN INCREASING KNOWLEDGE OF CAUSES

There was a time when man's attitude toward war was almost altogether fatalistic. It was accepted as part of the natural order, or the work of Fate, or as the Will of God. As long as this attitude was dominant, little could be done. One of the most hopeful signs of our times, on the other hand, is the fact war does not have to be accepted fatalistically. The causes are known and anyone willing to learn can inform himself.

When the causes of a disease are unknown and even the physicians, the experts are baffled, mankind is indeed in a sad plight. Thus during the Middle Ages, man was so utterly at the mercy of

the Black Death that his reactions were largely emotional and irrational. However, the moment the cause or causes of a disease are known, the way is open to find the remedy, and the moment the remedy is found all that is needed is application.

This is the stage which has been reached as far as war is concerned. Not only are the causes known but the remedies as well. Our chief trouble is application. Too many people still in all lands, due to ignorance, or prejudice, or sinful indifference, are unwilling to cooperate for peace. When men get to the place where they are willing to make a third or perhaps even a tenth of the sacrifices for peace that they have been willing to make for war, the cause of peace can be considered as won.

3. MAN'S GROWING VISION OF PEACE

When weary and heartsick with the tendencies of the times, the best way to restore sanity and courage is to take the long look at man's increasing vision of peace across the ages. It began long ago with the dawn of high religion, of ethical monotheism, with that remarkable Egyptian Pharaoh, Ikhnaton, who ruled from about 1375 to 1358 B.C. Believing that there is one God whose Providence extends to all lands, this most unusual ruler, unlike the other kings of the day, did not spend his time leading military expeditions, but in writing hymns and in trying to establish his new faith.

The next great move toward peace came with the Hebrew Prophets of the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. Amos, who delivered his message about 750 B.C., believed in one God, the God of all nations in whose name he denounced the war crimes and injustices of many countries, including his own. The nations must recognize the authority of the Moral Law, which to defy means destruction.[1] Here was laid over twenty-seven hundred years ago the basis of international law. Isaiah of Jerusalem (c. 740-686 B.C.), known as the Statesman Prophet, warned against entangling alliances and the trust in mere military might. To him or to his disciple, Micah, we also owe the splendid vision of universal peace when all the weapons of hate shall be transformed into agricultural instruments and when the nations shall never again prepare for war.[2] Similarly, Jeremiah of Anathoth (626-585 B.C.) repeatedly warned his king to keep his country out of war; he even went so

far as to urge the defenders of Jerusalem to lay down their arms and surrender to the Babylonians.[3]

Protests against war likewise came out of ancient Greece. Empedocles (c. 495-435 B.C.) spoke of "baneful strife," and urged men to follow Love rather than Strife. Plato (c. 427-347 B.C.), while no pacifist, yet as a convinced Panhellenist, was decidedly opposed to the stupid, devastating wars between the various petty Greek states which wasted Greece and made her an easy prey to foreign conquerors. If Plato were living today when war has become so utterly irrational, there can be no doubt but that with his high regard for reason he would repudiate it as a mad adventure unworthy of sane men, especially philosophers. Perhaps the Stoics made the greatest contribution in their conception of the universe as a Commonwealth of Reason; some of them even ventured to think of themselves as world citizens. Finally, the great dramatists must not be forgotten: Sophocles (c. 496-406 B.C.), and Euripides (480?-406? B.C.) deplored the suicidal strife between Greeks, and pictured the horrors of war as over against the blessings of peace.

There was also a peace movement in India. Buddha (born c. 560 B.C.) preached universal love for all creatures, and disdained violence and strife. King Asoka, the so-called Second Founder of Buddhism who ruled from 273 to 232 B.C., after engaging in a victorious war, renounced war and violence, publicly confessed his sin, and spent the rest of his life trying to right the harm he had done. He even carved his confession on stone pillars for the ages to read.[4] Moreover, the Song Celestial or *Bhagavad-Gita* (written between 200 B.C. and 200 A.D.), which is sometimes called the New Testament of Hinduism, contains one of the best defenses of pacifism and condemnation of militarism ever made. Thus the philosophy of peace has struck its roots deep in the soil of India; perhaps that is one reason why she, more than any other nation, plays the splendid role of peacemaker in our troubled age.

Regardless of present appearances, China, too, has a long tradition of peace. Taoism, one of the earliest philosophical and religious systems, is probably the most pacifistic the world has ever seen. Likewise, Confucius (551-479 B.C.) emphasized ethics and moral suasion rather than armed might. Even more, another outstanding teacher, Mo-ti (between 500 and 396 B.C.), preached

universal love and opposed strife since it means hate and murder, the violation of the law of love. He is credited with preventing or stopping two wars.

Western protests against war have their source largely in Christianity, especially in the teachings of Jesus. That the latter hated militarism and repudiated war seems certain not only from his teachings but even more from his example, choosing as he did not a sword and crown but a cross.[5] Likewise, some of the early Church Fathers were opposed to war; yet when the new religion became the official religion of the Roman Empire, it tended to revert to the militaristic and chauvinistic pattern of the primitive Hebrews.

The Medieval Church even waged wars of its own, though it did try to restrict the warlikeness of the feudal princes. Besides this, the great philosopher and theologian, St. Thomas Aquinas, following the earlier pronouncements of St. Augustine, tried to make a distinction between just wars in which Christians might engage and the unjust in which they must have no part; but it is extremely doubtful whether on the basis which St. Thomas lays down any modern war could be called just.[6] It must also be added that a few saints, such as St. Francis of Assisi, and a few thinkers, such as Abelard, repudiated war.[7]

Centuries later George Fox (1624-1691), founder of the Society of Friends, turned his back on war and began one of the greatest influences for peace in the modern world. True to the spirit of their Founder, the Friends are still in the forefront of the struggle for peace with a magnificent devotion, insight, and courage that amazes the world. During the same century in which Fox lived, Henry IV of France conceived his Grand Design for the federation of Europe, which, aside from certain obnoxious features, gave that war-ridden continent a vision of unity which it has never been able to forget. Some fifteen years later, in 1625, Hugo Grotius published his great book, *On the Rights of War and Peace,* in which he took the so-called Christian rulers to task for their indulgence in war, and proposed arbitration as a means of settling international disputes. Needless to say, this book created quite a stir; in fact, for the first time the conscience of Europe seemed to be seriously troubled; but above all else, it laid the basis for international law.[8]

In 1713 Abbé de St. Pierre, greatly concerned about the state of Europe, published a book calling for a perpetual alliance of the twenty-four Christian countries and the renunciation of war among themselves. Toward the close of the century Jeremy Bentham even went further by urging the reduction of armies, the emancipation of colonies together with the renunciation of imperialism and the creation of an international court for the settlement of problems. More significant still, in 1795 the great philosopher, Immanuel Kant, published his famous *Perpetual Peace* in which, among other things, he advocated the following as a basis for peace: no secret or unjust treaties; the gradual abolition of standing armies; no lending of money for war purposes; republican constitutions for all nations; and the formation of a federation of free states. Like that of Grotius, this book marked a milestone in man's endeavors for peace.

These protests coming from many sources eventually led to action. In 1816 the Peace Society was formed, which had for its object the promotion of understanding and good will by means of gradual disarmament and the principle of arbitration. It welcomed the support of all persons opposed to war. The influence of this society was tremendous, and since that time, of course, many similar organizations have been formed.

Moreover, in 1899 the first Hague Conference met at the invitation of the Russian government. Out of this arose the Permanent Court of Arbitration as a means of settling disputes between nations through mediation and arbitration. At the second Hague Conference in 1907 a serious attempt was made to strengthen the Court, but the spirit of nationalism allowed only meager success;[9] thus preparing the way for the terrible holocaust of 1914 when the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse rode far and wide spreading death and destruction.

Yet the will to peace did not die; rather it became stronger than ever. Out of this came man's first real attempt at world order through international cooperation, the League of Nations. In spite of many real accomplishments,[10] however, it eventually received its deathblow at the hands of nationalism. Mankind had not yet learned its lesson and the result was the Second World War, a holocaust even more frightful than the First. Still, regardless of

the failure of the League, men made another attempt toward world order in terms of the United Nations, of which more will be said later.

The present situation is truly paradoxical, especially as far as the United States is concerned. On the one hand, militarism is rampant and has already cursed us with one hot war which proved very difficult to stop. On the other hand, there is widespread interest in peace, especially in the liberal churches. Nor is there any question but that the peace forces won a great victory in the defeat of universal military training. The stage was certainly set for its enactment and the conditions seemed right; still, so great and earnest and persistent were the efforts of the lovers of peace and democracy that militarism suffered a resounding defeat. Similarly, though some very rash things were done in Korea,[11] the atom bomb was not used, and a truce has at long last been arranged. However precarious this truce may be, at least the fighting and carnage have been stopped.

Let us then take courage. The revolt against militarism and war is no small thing which began only yesterday. It began ages ago with high religion and profound thinking, and its roots are deep in every great civilization and culture. Today all the rich traditions must be utilized as resources in one mighty attempt to marshal mankind for peace.

4. THE ADVENT OF A NEW AGE

(1) *The Handwriting on the Wall*

In the Book of Daniel there is a dramatic scene. Belshazzar, the King, and a thousand of his lords are feasting hilariously, unconscious of approaching danger, when suddenly out of nowhere there appears a mysterious hand, writing the doom of Babylon on the wall. When the King in his consternation calls in his wise men, even they are unable to interpret the strange writing; and it is left unread until Daniel comes and deciphers the message of disaster.

There can be no doubt but that the two fiery bombs flaming from the skies and virtually destroying the two Japanese cities served as heralds of a new age. To some, they and all their relatives which have been produced since, not unlike the writing on Belshazzar's palace wall, seem to be nothing short of portents of

doom; and such they may become if men are content to remain complacent and stubborn and stupid. Instead, however, they could just as well become spurs and goads to awaken the unthinking to the dangers of war, the necessity of peace, and the vast possibilities of this new age. This very process, in fact as was seen at the beginning of the chapter, is beginning to take place; though as yet on far too small a scale. Still, this may well be the cloud the size of a man's hand.

Likewise, the Korean War has served to shock many out of their complacency and it should shock more as they envision it in all its horror. It is estimated that this war cost the United States alone nearly a hundred and forty-five thousand casualties; the land of Korea has been fearfully devastated; and the total number of casualties for all belligerents may exceed three million.[12] Neither has either side gained its original objective; but all have lost terribly in this little war. Consequently, all the major belligerents wanted a truce desperately; but in spite of their wishes, they found it exceedingly hard to stop the war. If this was true of a small war in which not all the major powers were actively engaged and in which the most deadly weapons were not employed, how much worse a major conflict would prove: worse because more deadly; worse because more futile; and worse because, like wildfire, impossible to stop.

Our deadly weapons, together with the Korean War and the Cold War, then may well be considered as the handwriting on the wall; not necessarily, indeed, as portents of inescapable doom but as warning signs; or, to revert to our previous figures, as spurs and as goads. Thus our age is big with possibilities for good as well as for evil. Which it shall be, let it be repeated, in the final analysis is up to us. Thus, there is hope since we have at the very least a fighting chance for peace.

(2) *Revolting Nations and Shaken Titans*

At the close of the Second World War two powers stood supreme; all the others had declined. Until recently the supremacy of these two powers remained largely unchallenged while each tried and is still trying to draw all the other nations into its respective orbit. The resulting Cold War threatened to divide the world into two hostile camps, a very dangerous state of affairs. In spite of the

great change which seems to be coming, the titans are still dreaming their dreams of grandeur and fighting the Cold War, though with some fear and trembling. Yet this change which is on its way may well be one of the most significant signs of hope in the new age.

The first intimation of this new trend undoubtedly came with the successful revolt of Yugoslavia's Marshal Tito. This proved that the Soviet Power is far from omnipotent, thus paving the way for future revolts. The great opportunity came with the death of Stalin and the present struggle for leadership within Russia. This touched off the smoldering spirit of nationalism in East Germany, soon followed by similar revolts in Poland and the other Communist satellites.

The great danger is that the other titan, thinking that the hour of opportunity has at long last arrived, begin a series of aggressive interferences which might prove disastrous. For example, Eisenhower's recent rather brazen offer of food was so clearly a political move as part of the stategy of fighting the Cold War, that the result has been nothing but increased bitterness. Let no one think for a moment that the Russian oligarchy is ready to go on the rocks; no more than Hitler's government when he instigated the bloody purges. Marshal Tito, who is in a better position to know, has warned that the West had best go slow. Furthermore, recent events indicate that the crafty Yugoslav leader has made his peace with the Kremlin, though perhaps largely on his own terms. Thus one thing becomes crystal clear: interferences on the part of the United States will only serve to consolidate the Communists about their leaders, and it might result in a Third World War. At any rate, East Germany today is both a symbol of danger and a symbol of hope.

Again, the other titan has fared far from well. To begin with, Korea has proven a terrible disillusionment in more ways than one. Instead of a swift victory, there was a slow three years war of attrition. Again, the spectacle of a second rate Eastern army holding a first rate Western army at bay, has shown that the United States is no more omnipotent than Russia. Finally, if there are revolts in the camp of the latter, there are also significant revolts in the camp of the former. Disgusted with the conduct of

the Korean War on the one hand, and with definite fascistic tendencies within the United States on the other, Great Britain has not hesitated to speak out. In fact, if we do not change our foreign policy and conduct our domestic affairs in a more democratic manner, all our allies may desert us.

Moreover, one of the most significant revolts is that of the South Koreans under Syngman Rhee. That Rhee's attempts to block the truce were irrational this writer would freely grant; for he has little respect for the fascistic tendencies of the South Korean President. What is really significant about this revolt, however, is the fact that one of our smallest allies, and one which owes so much to us, is independent enough to assert itself. This plainly shows that our prestige has fallen and that there is very little solidity in our Western alliance. The failure to establish an adequate European army and the mutterings of the members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization are further proof.

In short, though still powerful and influential, both Russia and the United States are losing their grip; and as a result the danger that the world be divided into two hostile camps making a Third World War inevitable, is diminishing. As Walter Lippman has pointed out, it is doubtful whether even the Big Four, not to mention the Big Two, still have power enough to make a world settlement. In fact, he holds that we are facing a new era in which the many nations, including even some of the smaller ones, are getting tired of being pushed around by the Big Powers and are beginning to assert themselves.[13] Insofar as this means that in the light of recent events, the world is less likely to become solidly divided into two armed camps, this is definitely a reason for a measure of optimism. However, it does not mean that danger is past and we can relax without fear. The struggle between East and West is still going on and could flame up into the hell of a Third World War very quickly and easily, especially in East Germany, in Trieste, and in Korea and other parts of Asia.

5. STARS IN THE NIGHT

(1) *The United Nations*

The United Nations was organized in San Francisco during the summer of 1945 by the representatives of fifty nations with a total

population of 1,700,000,000 people. Like its predecessor, the League of Nations, it is far from perfect; hampered by the spirit of nationalism from its very birth, it has not accomplished all that its friends had dared hope. In fact, as Walter Lippman has pointed out, the great danger is that in their pursuit of the Cold War, America and Russia may tear it to shreds.[14] Yet no one can rationally doubt its vast significance in this age of conflict. Perhaps it is nothing less than the outstanding endeavor for peace which has been launched in our time.

Though there are many roads that lead to war, the road to peace always sooner or later leads to and through and from the United Nations. To begin with, it is the living symbol of the world's hope for international unity. Schemes for immediate world government are doomed to failure, but the United Nations is a living fact. Amid the chaotic sea of international confusion and tumult it stands like a great lighthouse. Only by steering their crafts by its light shall the nations in our time find the harbor of peace and security.

Again, the United Nations has certain practical accomplishments to its credit. It has stopped three regional wars: the conflict between Israel and the Arabs; the struggle between the Dutch and the Indonesians; and the strife which involved India and Pakistan. Besides this, in 1945 it secured the withdrawal of British and French troops from Syria and Lebanon; in 1946 it caused the withdrawal of Russian troops from Iran; and greater still, in 1949 it provided the means for the peaceful settlement of the Berlin Blockade. If a peaceful solution had not been found for the latter, it might easily have engulfed the world in the horrors of a Third World War. The United Nation's part in ending the Blockade also shows that this world organization has within it the possibilities of finding constructive solutions to differences even between big powers. In short, the United Nations stands as a neutral referee and clearing-house to which all nations may submit their differences without losing face.

Moreover, it must not be forgotten that every single day this great international agency has numerous committees and organizations working to find solutions to complicated problems which may contain the seeds of future conflicts. Among these are the following: the International Court of Justice; the Food and Agricultural

Organization; the Atomic Energy Commission; United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); and many more besides.

Finally, the United Nations in a real sense serves as the conscience of the world. There every nation, even the smallest, has the right to air its grievances so that the whole world may hear. It must also be remembered that world opinion is becoming an increasingly powerful factor. The day is at hand when it will take the place of military force now become too dangerous for safe use. At any rate, it deterred the Dutch in Indonesia, and even the titans cannot altogether ignore it.

Thus, as the place where world opinion is enthroned, it is evident that the United Nations is one of the most important signs of hope, in spite of whatever temporary eclipse it may be suffering due to the Korean War. Everything must be done to strengthen it. When the news was received at Lake Success that Russia had exploded an atom bomb, former Secretary-General Trygve Lie truly said: "Now the United Nations is more indispensable than ever." This is even more true now that both titans have the hydrogen bomb.

(2) *The Neutral Nations*

Another hopeful sign of the times is the existence of a group of neutral nations who have resisted all attempts of the titans and have not been drawn into either orbit. In Europe there are Sweden and Switzerland, and the most important in Asia is, of course, India. The brilliant prime minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, an outstanding liberal, has constantly tried to steer his country clear of both orbits.[15] More than this, Nehru and the Indian government have exceeded all others in pressing for a truce or a negotiated peace in Korea.[16] Next to the United Nations and the liberal wing of the Christian and Jewish churches, it may well be that India is the greatest sign of hope for peace.

Besides India, certain countries among our allies have also shown a constructive attitude conducive to peace. Chief among these is Great Britain. If we are to be saved, it may be by our allies and neutral nations, such as India. Perhaps in the future even Japan and Germany, with their bitter memories of the evils of militarism,

may become real powers for peace in the world. At any rate, this is another star of hope in our darkened world.

(3) *Peace-minded Minorities*

Great causes have gone forward, largely through the untiring efforts of minorities. High religion in terms of ethical monotheism was at first represented only by a few scorned, persecuted prophets and thinkers; but believing that truth and history were on their side they persisted in their efforts and their cause finally won the day. The same was true of the Confucian movement in China, the early Christian movement, the modern scientific movement, the anti-slavery movement, and many others. The time came when these causes triumphed because the minorities who represented them were able to convince the majorities.

Through the centuries, as we have seen, there has been a slowly growing minority which has made world peace its aim. In our day this group is larger than ever; the crusaders for peace are to be found in every land. Among them are scientists, educators, outstanding ministers of religion, philosophers, labor leaders, farm leaders, and even a few business and political leaders. Their great courage and devotion is perhaps our brightest star of hope.

NOTES

1 Amos 1-3.

2 Is. 2:1-4; Micah 4:1-5.

3 Jer. 38:1-6.

4 For this remarkable confession, see Hopkins, *The Ethics of India,* pp. 152-55.

5 On this point, see Raven, *War and the Christian,* pp. 125-29.

6 For an excellent exposition of St. Thomas' views, see Bernard, *War and Its Causes,* pp. 127-29.

7 On Abelard's repudiation of war, see Mayer, *A History of Ancient & Medieval Philosophy,* p. 405.

8 For the contributions of Henry IV and Grotius, see Trueblood, *The Development of the Peace Idea,* pp. 16-17.

9 On the Conferences, see Buell, *International Relations,* pp. 529, 576, 579-80, 639.

10 For its successes, see Chambers-Harris-Bayley, *This Age of Conflict,* p. 131.

11 Perhaps the most rash was the march to the Chinese border against the advice of Great Britain and India; see Harrison, *This Age of Global Strife,* pp. 383-84.

12 See Defense Department figures in *The Detroit Free Press,* Oct. 24, 1953, p. 12.

13 See his article, "Do We Face New Era?", *The Detroit Free Press,* Section B, July 5, 1953, p. 1.

14 *The Cold War,* p. 59.

15 See Rosinger, "India," in *The State of Asia* by Rosinger and Associates, p. 486.

16 See Farley, "The Korean Crisis and the United Nations," in Rosinger and Associates, *op. cit.,* p. 160.

CHAPTER SEVEN

The Essentials of Strategy and Action

1. OUR GREAT NEED: THOUGHTFUL ACTION

Americans are far too adolescent when it comes to international relations. Among other things, they are prone to act quickly on the spur of the moment without much thought; and they expect quick results. Moreover, dominated by their superiority complex, they tend to disregard the maturer wisdom of those who come from older nations and cultures. In short, if we do not grow up soon in our international thinking, the result may be nothing less than calamitous.

Important as action undoubtedly is, unless it is thoughtful matters may become worse. Whether we like it or not, our foreign policy has been a failure. The Truman policy of attempting to contain Russia has brought us nothing but grief. Nor is the policy of the present Administration any better. In fact, it has all but lost us our allies, so that in this crucial hour when we should be able to take leadership we are neither trusted nor respected abroad.[1]

What is needed, above all else, is a new, daring, creative approach in terms of thoughtful action. Such action would first of all be based on a sound, adequate philosophy of peace; that is, it would reject the materialistic and fascistic philosophies of power in favor of a more idealistic approach. Second, it would be realistic enough to take into account the significance of this new age: that war must be repudiated if we are to live; that the world, whether we like it or not, has in reality become one, so that what happens to any people sooner or later affects all; and that no one nation or group of nations can dominate this planet but all most cooperate for the common good or face a common doom. Third, as over against the petty, shortsighted policies which dominate the present

scene, it would be comprehensive and farsighted, thinking in terms of distant goals as well as immediate needs and ready to utilize the wisdom and experience of all. Finally, it must be psychologically and sociologically, as well as philosophically and ethically sound; that is, it must be imaginative enough to consider the thinking and feeling of all peoples of all cultures. American foreign policy has failed to a large degree because there has been far too little attempt to put ourselves in the place of the people of other nations, especially our opponents.

The supreme danger at this hour is quick, hasty, ill-considered American action to exploit present Russian difficulties. It cannot be repeated often enough that any such action will prove disastrous: it will only serve to consolidate all Communists about their leaders. It may also lead to the wrecking of the Korean peace conference, the resumption of the fighting, and to other little wars in vital spots with the intention of wearing us out; or, such paranoiac fear in the Kremlin as to lead to an all out surprise attack on our cities and World War Three. History teaches us that any regime in power which feels a sense of insecurity in sheer desperation may plunge into war.

2. EIGHT STEPS TOWARD PERPETUAL PEACE

Anyone who expects a blueprint with all the technical details will be disappointed in what follows. The details must be left to the political scientists, the diplomats, and the statesmen. While recognizing the importance of technical knowledge, it is the mission of the philosopher to look at a situation in terms of its deeper meaning and its broader perspectives; and this ambitious task must be attempted in spite of its difficulties and the writer's limited insight. In fact, it is the philosopher's duty to God and man to make this attempt since one of the chief difficulties is a mass of technical knowledge in terms of facts without the necessary synoptic vision. As a result men fail to see the forest for the trees. Fastening their attention on certain unrelated facts, they miss seeing the really significant trends of the age, and therefore all their feverish actions are doomed to failure.

Again, as there is no one cause of war but many related causes, so there is no one thing which will bring peace. In other words,

the way to survival and peace, it has already become clear, must be synoptic; many things must be done at the same time. This writer believes that the crucial hour has come when not less than eight significant steps must be begun toward peace. He is not so naive, however, to think that they will be taken immediately or that they will bring perpetual peace immediately. Nevertheless, he is convinced that these eight steps lead away from the threat of war in the general direction of perpetual peace. More than this, he believes this is the direction in which the nations ought to be going in this new age. And the very fact that considerable progress has already been made, makes it probable that, having tried all the false ways with nothing but grief, mankind may soon be ready for this greater adventure.

Nor are these eight steps in any sense original. Many thinkers, far more able, have proposed all of them in some form or fashion. Moreover, as has already been stated, some beginning has already been made, but far too small to meet the crucial demands of this hour of decision.

(1) *A New, Bold, Universal, Peace Endeavor*

As part of the creative response so necessary in the atomic age, the United Nations through its Secretary-General should take the daring step of declaring a world emergency. This is fully justified not only by the general world situation but in terms of current events. In times past nations declared such states of emergency, and it meant speeding up the arms program and in many other ways preparing the nation for war. The kind of emergency suggested here differs in two ways: it would embrace the entire planet which is something new; and it would herald the beginnings of a gigantic, universal peace endeavor—the greatest ever launched.

This peace endeavor would include two things: a peace crusade reaching every country, city, and village for the purpose of mobilizing mankind for peace as men were once mobilized for war, and an emergency peace conference. The peace crusade would come first. Outstanding leaders with an international outlook and a real concern for peace should be drawn from all walks of life and enlisted as speakers and organizers. Each country would, of course, set up its own natural approach and program but encouragement

would be given to the use of foreign speakers made available through the good offices of the United Nations. A month would be set aside designated as WORLD PEACE MONTH, so that the whole world would be thinking about peace at the same time. The mass meetings in every community would be carefully planned, making use of all interested persons and giving them the thrill of working for peace instead of for war. Speakers and leaders, however, should be chosen only from the most capable. They might be drawn from churches, colleges, professional peace groups, business, labor, and farm groups. The women and their organizations might likewise prove a powerful source of help and support.

The speakers at the mass meetings should discuss the present world crisis, the desperate need of peace, the steps toward peace, and people should be thoroughly familiarized with the coming World Conference, both with its possibilities and its limitations; above all else, the people must not be taught to expect too much, yet at the same time neither too little. Moreover, the mass meetings should be followed up by many smaller meetings of various groups with special interests in certain problems relative to peace. They might also be influential in bringing pressure to bear on their governments to give full support to the World Conference and not to obstruct its progress. In short, the purpose of the popular crusade would be to enlighten the people and to create the vast mass support necessary for the success of the Conference.[2]

The great World Conference should follow as soon as possible after WORLD PEACE MONTH.[3] It should be preceded by months of the most careful preparation. In view of the fact that no Big Two or Big Four Conference is sufficient for the needs of these times, *all nations,* including both Red China and Franco's Spain, should be invited. Moreover, it should be composed of the top leaders of *all governments.* The meeting should not be held in Russia or in the United States but perhaps in Switzerland, using the old League of Nations buildings. In order to avoid controversy and also to increase the prestige of the United Nations, the Secretary-General might well preside.

The purpose of the Conference would be to begin work on some kind of over-all settlement and plan so that all may live. In order that Russia and the United States not be tempted to use it as but

another occasion for fighting the Cold War by hurling charges at each other, the role of the other nations, and especially the neutral nations, such as India, is strategic. As a third Giant speaking to the two Giants, these other nations must let America and the Soviet Union know that they are absolutely tired of the Cold War and all the evils to which it has led, including the Korean and other "hot" little wars.

In other words, these nations should enter into a conspiracy, a constructive and peaceful conspiracy to shame the two belligerents into an attitude conducive toward an effective solution of the Cold War. Whenever the Russians or the Americans would begin shouting charges, there should be able statesmen from the other countries ready to answer them before the white light of world opinion, thus eventually tiring them into reasonableness. Military threats only lead to paranoiac fears and new Koreas, but such a strategy as here proposed, exposure before the world's critical gaze, might have a salutary effect, since neither nation can afford to lose face.

(2) *The Repudiation of War*

The first great task of the Conference should be the repudiation of war. A beginning would have to be made by a bold attempt to extinguish the little fires, that is, the little wars which might still be raging. This should not be done through months of long wrangling while the killing and destruction goes on, but by an immediate truce. Whatever adjustments needed to be made following the truce should be placed into the hands of committees of civilians, that is, expert diplomats, representing both the belligerents and the neutrals; but the military on both sides should be rigidly excluded. Any questions which could not be settled by the committees should be brought before the whole Conference so that the world can hear and pass judgment, but with both sides given an equal opportunity to state their case.

Following this serious attempt to stamp out the little wars, the nations should bind themselves never again to resort to war as a means of settling difficulties but to make use of the arbitration facilities afforded by the United Nations. This alone would not be enough, since similar pledges have been made before, yet never by all nations, nor under such circumstances.[4] At any rate, with the

whole world longing for peace as never before, and increasingly aware of the consequences of a Third World War, it might have a decided moral and even political effect. It might, in fact, create such tidal waves of popular support that, having taken this initial step, the morale of the Conference would be so heightened as to sweep away many of the obstructions due to matters of special interest to certain nations which have impeded and stymied so many previous international conferences.

(3) *A Rational Plan of Disarmament and Atomic Control*

One of the chief functions of the proposed World Conference would be to explore new ways of dealing effectively with some of the problems which so far have baffled all United Nations' efforts. Chief among these is the thorny question of disarmament and atomic control. To begin with, an over-all, gradual policy of total disarmament, including weapons in all categories, should be adopted. This program should be completed within twelve or fifteen years under the direction of the United Nations.

Atomic control would perhaps be the most difficult feature of such a plan. However, in trying to find a workable solution, not only the American and Russian but also all other proposals should be given serious consideration point by point, with scientists from many countries taking a leading part in the discussions, along with diplomats.[5] There must be no cessation of effort until some rational plan based upon mutual compromise and agreement is adopted. In case of a deadlock, let the whole matter be brought before the Conference and debated before the world, and let the group be sent back like a jury until the task is accomplished, so that men can breathe easier. Of one thing, however, we can be sure: there is no perfect plan, and if atomic control must wait until the search has been completed we may all be blown to smithereens. Far better is some rational plan, which can be amended as the need arises, than no plan at all as at present. Certainly the latter is by far the greater security risk.

The chief difficulty will be persuading America and Russia to compromise; but here again the other countries might exercise a decisive influence. Likewise the churches, the professional peace organizations, and other groups could bring pressure to bear. In

short, so crucial is the problem of disarmament that everything possible must be done to break the present impasse and to find a reasonable solution.

(4) *The Recall of Armies of Occupation*

Along with disarmament all armies of occupation must be withdrawn. Of course, there is real danger in this. It may be contended that the Communists would immediately take over some countries as they attempted to do in South Korea. In some instances this might be true; but hardly in such important nations as Germany and Japan. Though East Germany is dominated by Communists, this is certainly not true in the West, where the anti-Russian spirit is far too strong. The Marxian threat is far less real now with present revolts against Soviet authority. Likewise, in the case of Japan, its traditions are so predominantly nationalistic that the greatest danger would probably be the revival of the old militarism, though there are today certain decidedly democratic and even pacifistic tendencies in Nippon.[6] Italy might go to the Left but perhaps even to the Right.[7]

In fact, the best way to influence these countries to go to the extreme Left or the extreme Right is through a long continued occupation. No conquered country has ever loved its conquerors. At first, outwardly, through sheer necessity, they may make many friendly pretensions, but inwardly the secret hate festers until the day of reckoning. If the truth were told it would become evident that the conquered countries hate both the Americans and Russians; and as time goes on they will play America and Russia against each other in the hope of eventually ridding themselves of both.

Worst of all, the presence of hostile armies continually facing each other naturally produces friction, friction will produce incidents, and incidents may start a chain reaction which may bring war as in 1914. The situation is especially grave in Germany; so grave, in fact, that an objective observer such as Walter Lippman thinks the showdown may come there.[8]

Again, other objective observers, such as Howard K. Smith, report that almost invariably in the occupied countries, the reactionary, rather than the progressive forces, are favored by the Americans.[9] This could lead to the revival of Nazism and Fascism.

Certainly our attempts to force rearmament on Germany and Japan will not help the cause of democracy. At the same time it will cause such fears in Russia that no one need be surprised at what the Kremlin may hatch next.[10] Perhaps Americans could have some idea of how Russians feel with our armies virtually at their back door, if they would try to imagine how they would feel if matters were reversed and there were Soviet armies in Canada, Mexico, and in Cuba. If there is to be peace, we need to make use of our imagination by trying to put ourselves into the position of others.

(5) *Relieving the Plight of Divided Nations*

One of the most deplorable consequences of the Second World War was the division of certain countries. There can be no doubt but that this stupid policy was one of the factors causing the Korean War; and however foolish old Syngman Rhee undoubtedly is in his insinuations that he will renew the war if his wishes are not granted, still one can sympathize with his desire for a united Korea.

Today in some respects Germany is the world's chief danger spot. The unrest there, especially in East Germany, could easily serve as the spark to set off a major conflict. Beneath this unrest in both sections is German nationalism, the desire for a united country. That this same spirit is on the march in West Germany is certainly evident from the recent Sunday sermon of the great liberal church leader, Bishop Dibelius, head of the Evangelical Church.[11] In his message the Bishop called on all the powers to grant free elections as a move toward restoring a reunited Germany. This is a call that must be heeded by both Americans and Russians. The handwriting is on the wall that he who runs may read: there can be no real peace in our time until these wounds are healed. Korea should be sufficient warning.

Difficult as this task may be, it is not impossible. In some cases it may even mean coalition governments in which even the native Marxian parties must be allowed some share in the government. Though this is far from the ideal, it may be the best possible solution under certain circumstances. At any rate, the present conditions in these countries are simply intolerable, serving to breed future dictators and wars.[12]

(6) *A Vast United Nations' Assistance Program*

America has been called an island of luxury in a vast sea of human misery; nor has anyone painted a more graphic picture of the poverty and want of the mass of mankind than Stringfellow Barr.[13] Since poverty is one of the basic causes of war, it is obvious that such misery is not conducive to peace. Dictatorships of the crudest types arise in countries where poverty and hunger are rampant. Many Americans believe that if more support, military and otherwise, had been given the Nationalist regime, China would not have gone Communist; but they do not know the facts. It was hunger, the desire to be delivered from the curse of poverty together with the corruption of Chiang's party and its lack of an effective plan, which drove the country to Communism.[14]

Obviously, if war is to be prevented, poverty and hunger must be banished. First of all, everything must be done that is humanely possible to deal with immediate situations of dire need. The millions of refugees must be provided for, and bleeding Korea must be restored. This is a project in which the United Nations is engaged, but her resources are pitifully small in comparison to the immense human need. Small groups have done something and can do more, but not anywhere enough. It is a problem so vast that only the world community can really cope with it.

The world's poverty must in reality be attacked in many ways; there is no one way. In our investigation of the causes of war, it became evident that overpopulation is a cause of poverty which, in turn, operates as a cause of war. It was also pointed out that a sane program of birth control, education, and industrialization would help to solve this gigantic problem. There can be no doubt but that countries such as China and India must speed up this process of industrialization. Along with this, without which, in fact, the former would be largely ineffective, they must greatly improve their agriculture, as indeed they are trying to do on a small scale. Vast projects, such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, must be established in many countries. In fact, this writer believes that Stringfellow Barr is on the right track when he strongly insists on a TVA of the world administered through the United Nations.[15]

The chief difficulty, however, is financial; most countries do not

have the means for such an enterprise. It is here that Point Four comes in—a greatly expanded Point Four or World TVA, if you please through the United Nations. Readers will recall that the Point Four Program was announced in 1949 by former President Truman as a means of providing American funds to increase United Nations' aid to undeveloped areas in terms of technical assistance. In answer to the President's suggestion, Congress voted the miserably small sum of ten million dollars. To this twenty-nine other nations added another ten million. So the United Nations faces the world's dire need with the beggarly, insignificant sum of twenty million dollars![16] This is hardly a drop in the bucket.

To relieve poverty and rebuild the world's economy, former Senator Brien McMahon proposed the United States contribute not less than ten billion dollars a year for five years to a great world fund; and Walter Reuther, President of the United Automobile Workers, calls for thirteen billion a year for a hundred years.[17] This writer proposes a world fund of at least twenty-five billion a year, with the United States appropriating as its share at least fifteen billion.

Many so-called practical men will insist this is unreasonable, and will ask where the money can be obtained. In answer, it is well to remind them that the Eighty-second Congress, out of a total budget of $91,626,541,746, appropriated not less than $77,201,739,830 for armaments; that is, about eighty-five per cent went for preparation for war with little protest on the part of American citizens.[18] Never in all history has any nation tried so hard to spend itself into bankruptcy! Now, if what Russia and the other nations spend for armaments is added to what we spend, the total is really astronomical, altogether fantastic, good evidence that the world is on its way to global madness.

Why should it be thought foolish to spend twenty-five billion dollars a year constructively for assistance to heal the world's bleeding wounds, but sane and rational, a good investment, to spend many times that much every year for the means of destruction? The chief reason why nations are still willing to spend so extravagantly for war and so pitifully little for peace is the lingering belief armaments can still bring security. Yet, it has been shown that, in the long run, instead of security they bring: insecurity and sus-

picion, economic bankruptcy, a feverish armament race leading ever nearer to the abyss, and finally war, and utter destruction since there is no defense against atomic weapons. In short, when the nations pour their wealth into armaments they are contributing to one of the basic causes of war—they are buying the very destruction which they fear.

On the other hand, when they disarm and invest a fraction of their savings in assistance, they are really helping to remove some of the basic causes of war: poverty, fear, and insecurity. The thrill of hope which such a program would inspire could serve as a mighty power for peace. Hence, to insist that the investment of twenty-five billion dollars a year in a gigantic assistance program is unreasonable turns out to be baseless. What is unreasonable is the draining of the world's wealth down the sewer of militarism and war. Until this waste is stopped, and until the world's wealth is used constructively, there is no escape from the worst miseries.

(7) *Instead of Imperialism: Trade for the Mutual Good*

Both Russia and the West must recognize that all imperialism, however subtle, is doomed. Every day one reads of new outbursts of popular wrath against this iniquitous thing. The day of empires is gone forever, but the day of the people is dawning. The trouble is that many of our diplomats have not realized this fact. Hence, our many blunders in Asia and the anti-American outbreaks. Many Oriental countries would rather starve than accept offers of American aid with strings attached, which would reduce them to the status of virtual satellites. Nor has the Kremlin any occasion for rejoicing if the recent revolts in East Germany and other satellite states mean anything. The time has come for both Moscow and Washington to recognize present political realities by ceasing their policies of trying to dominate other nations. Instead, they had best put their own houses in order.

However, as over against imperialism, perhaps the opportunities for trade were never greater; and trade, if conducted in such a manner as to contribute to the mutual good of all concerned, can be an influence for peace. Everything possible must be done to encourage business and industry. Above all else, there must be an increasing number of agreements to reduce tariffs and other bar-

riers to trade. Along with nationalism, the bane of Europe, as every traveler will testify, are the many obstructions to the free flow of goods between countries. Just when science has made possible more goods as the physical basis for a more abundant life for all, our archaic political and economic systems and devices still turn back the feet of progress. Perhaps more than all else, the barriers to trade between East and West must be lifted. The United Nations is working hard on this very problem; and the kind of World Conference which we have proposed might be a decided help in this worthy endeavor.

If a world-wide depression immeasurably worse than the last is not to occur, resulting in new dictatorships and new threats to peace, everything possible must be done to clear the channels of trade. To provide access to raw materials, more Schuman Plans are also in order. Moreover, the United States must do something to regulate her wild, war-inflated economy. What is needed is for the government to begin now siphoning expenditures from the wasteful arms traffic to constructive enterprises of many kinds. Such projects would serve as a cushion to prevent our national economy from going into a tailspin, and upsetting the rest of the world as well now that the Korean war is over. If there is to be peace, we must plan for it. As long as we plan for war rather than peace, the lesson of history is that war will come.

(8) *Strengthening the United Nations*

It is still fashionable for some defenders of the United Nations to insist that the Korean War marks something of a triumph for that organization since it is, they contend, the first attempt to meet aggression by united action under an international standard.[19] Similarly, Dr. Northrop, in a book which is truly great in many respects, blames Prime Minister Nehru and India rather severely for taking a neutral stand.[20] The Korean War was chiefly due to two underlying causes: the stupidity in dividing the country in the first place; and, even more perhaps, the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union. As long as the latter continues, there is always the danger of other outbreaks in weak spots. In short, it would seem that this bitter so-called "Police Action" represents in reality one of the failures of the United Nations, both

in failing to unite the country, and also in failing to stop the Cold War.

At any rate, the prestige of the great world organization has fallen decidedly, especially in the United States. In fact, in some quarters there seems to be a tendency to blame the United Nations for all our difficulties. This attitude is unfair and deplorable. For after all, the United Nations did not start either the Korean or the more basic Cold War. Nor is it responsible for the United States becoming involved in the former; in fact, the reverse is true.[21] Moreover, Americans must not forget that without United Nations' support our forces would have fared far worse in Korea.

However, the most important thing, after all, is that the United Nations is our chief hope for world unity and peace; and it has some remarkable accomplishments to its credit.[22] In this crucial hour we must not only have faith in its possibilities but everything possible must be done to strengthen it. Three things can and must be done toward this end.

First, as a true world organization all nations should be invited to join, including Red China and Franco's Spain. It is interesting to note that in his book, *War or Peace,* published in 1950, John Foster Dulles insisted that it should embrace all nations, not just those we like. He even favored the entrance of Communist China after a period of testing.[23] Certainly, nothing would strengthen it more and increase its prestige than for it to become all inclusive.[24] America's objection to the inclusion of China and Russia's opposition to the entrance of Spain are both clearly due to prejudice; perhaps the two could strike a bargain.

Second, the United Nations must receive better financial support. Its present budget of less than fifty million a year is ridiculously low. We starve it to death and yet we expect it to accomplish marvels. We spend countless billions preparing for war and a few mites preparing for peace. If we do not change our ways, we shall perish from the earth. In short, the United Nations should have a budget forty or fifty times its present size. Even that would be small when its true significance is taken into consideration.

Finally, if the United Nations is to be strengthened, it must dare to be more courageous. In the past, it has been far too timid and too slow. Let it attempt the new, bold, universal, peace en-

deavor suggested at the beginning of this chapter. The meeting of a great World Conference under its direction would certainly tend to increase its prestige. Besides, such a Conference might well be made a yearly affair till the present emergency becomes less acute. By thus presiding over the heads of all the governments, the transition to world government might, in fact, become easy and natural as time went on. Moreover, since one of the chief causes of war is ignorance, along with the crusade for peace suggested in this chapter, the United Nations should begin a much greater peace education program than it has ever dared to launch before. Until there comes a decided change in public opinion, we shall continue to have wars; but a vast process of education on community levels and for all ages, as part of a long range program, might do much toward producing the desired effect. On a schoolhouse somewhere in France are these words: "If you want peace, you must write it in the hearts of the young." [25]

3. IN CONCLUSION

Rough and difficult as the way to the temple of perpetual peace may seem during our darker hours, yet we must never despair of finally reaching it. The causes of war and what needs to be done are clear enough to those who have taken the time to inform themselves; but to apply the remedy before the night engulfs us, there lies our bitter need. Nothing is more necessary than moral courage, the will to persistent action in the face of great obstacles. If we fail as other civilizations before us have failed, it may be written down as a failure of nerve.

What is really needed in the face of the greatest threat man ever faced, is a total mobilization for peace. As men once mobilized for war, drawing on all their resources, so they must now mobilize for peace. Religion, philosophy, science, business, labor, the farmer, certainly all teachers, and above all the mothers of men whose sons the terrible Mars ever and anon demands in bloody sacrifice—all these must be rallied in one mighty endeavor for survival and a better day.

NOTES

1 For a realistic appraisal of the dismal failures of our foreign policy, see the editorial, "Could Any Good Come Out of Bermuda?", in *The Christian Century,* July 8, 1953, pp. 790-91. For another drastic criticism of American foreign policy, see Barr, *Citizens of the World,* especially pp. 15-72.

2 This writer took part in a peace crusade on a smaller scale in North Dakota some years ago. It showed real signs of success until the coming of the Korean War. At one meeting there were a thousand people present.

3 It is interesting to note the present Secretary of State suggested a similar conference some years ago; see his *War or Peace,* pp. 207-10. He pleads quite eloquently for it. The idea of a popular peace crusade was suggested by Dr. Einstein in his statement, "the facts of atomic energy" must be taken "to the village square" as the ultimate source of political decision.

4 The Pact of Paris signed by nearly fifty nations by the end of 1931 was the most universal. Still it had one great weakness: it did not come from any great international organization. On the Pact, see Benns, *Europe Since 1914,* pp. 154-55; and Chambers-Harris-Bayley, *This Age of Conflict,* pp. 141-42, 371-72.

5 For the problem of disarmament and the chief differences between the American and Russian plans of atomic energy control, see Lawson, "The United Nations: Disarmament and Propaganda" in *Current History,* April, 1952, pp. 216-20. On atomic energy control also see Lapp, *The New Force,* pp. 98-115. For some signs of hope that Russia may be willing to compromise, see *The Christian Science Monitor,* Oct. 31, 1953, p. 1.

6 On this point, see "Report by Adlai Stevenson," *Look,* May 19, 1953, p. 32; also Braden, *War, Communism and World Religions,* p. 35, and Alsop, "The Japanese Joke Apparently on Us," *The Detroit Free Press,* Oct. 24, 1953, p. 6.

7 For conditions in Europe, see Smith, *The State of Europe,* and for Asia, Rosinger and Associates, *The State of Asia.* Leber (ed.), *World Faith in Action,* also contains a rather objective view of world conditions as seen by a group of religious leaders.

8 See his article, "Showdown in Germany," *Look,* May 19, 1953, pp. 113-15.

9 Smith, *op. cit.,* pp. 131-32, 218-21.

10 *Ibid.,* pp. 60-61.

11 Though the sermon was actually preached in the Russian zone it resounded throughout Germany; see *The Christian Century,* July 15, 1953, pp. 811-12.

12 Since Austria is related to and dependent upon Germany, she should be allowed to join that country if she desires.

13 See his little book, *Let's Join the Human Race.*

14 For a graphic account of the fall of the Nationalist regime and the reasons for it, see Stockwell, *With God in Red China,* pp. 26-46. Since the author, a Christian missionary, was imprisoned by the Communists he certainly cannot be accused of favoring them.

15 In his *Citizens of the World,* especially pp. 135-68.

16 See Fenichell and Andrews, *The United Nations,* pp. 68-69; also Barr, *Let's Join the Human Race,* p. 4.

17 *Ibid.,* pp. 4-5.

18 *The World Almanac 1952,* pp. 64-65. The present Administration is trying hard to make reductions, but as pointed out before, the sum spent is still vast. Moreover, since Russia now has the hydrogen bomb or at least the secret of the bomb, there are signs that cuts in defense may be restored.

19 See, for example, Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold's article in *United Nations Reporter,* July, 1953, p. 6.

20 *The Taming of the Nations,* p. 30. History may prove that Nehru was right, as it seems to be doing already. On the absurd aftermath of the Korean War, see Alsop, "Korean Tragedy Becoming Comedy," *The Detroit Free Press,* Oct. 17, 1953, p. 8.

21 See Farley, "The Korean Crisis and the United Nations" in Rosinger and Associates, *op. cit.,* p. 156.

22 See previous discussion, p. 129.

23 See *op. cit.,* p. 190.

24 For an excellent discussion of the present status of the United Nations and what can be done to strengthen it, see Dean, "For 'A More Perfect Union,'" *The Christian Century,* July 15, 1953, pp. 816-17.

25 There are signs that the churches are beginning to awaken to the needs of the hour. The recent statement sent out by the governing body of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. to ministers and laymen was nothing short of remarkable. The great hope is that other denominations will follow suit and join hands in beginning a great crusade for peace and freedom. The Friends are doing excellent work in peace education, but it is as yet on far too small a scale.

Bibliography

Albery, Michael. "The Cost of Wars." *Political Science Quarterly,* June, 1952, pp. 267-82.

Alsop, Joseph. "Korean Tragedy Becoming a Comedy." *The Detroit Free Press,* Oct. 17, 1953, p. 8.

..... "The Japanese Joke Apparently on Us." *The Detroit Free Press,* Oct. 24, 1953, p. 6.

Alsop, Stewart & Dr. Ralph E. Lapp. "The Inside Story of Our First Hydrogen Bomb." *The Saturday Evening Post,* Oct. 25, 1952, pp. 150-54.

Aristotle. *Politics.* In McKeon, *The Basic Works of Aristotle,* pp. 1127-1316.

Augustine. *The City of God* (trans. John Healey). London: J. M. Dent & Sons, Ltd., 1931.

Bailey, Thomas A. *America Faces Russia.* Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Press, 1950.

Barr, Stringfellow. *Let's Join the Human Race.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1950.

..... *Citizens of the World.* Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1952.

Barry, F. R. *Recovery of Man.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949.

Barth, Karl & Edward Thurneysen. *God's Search For Man* (trans. George W. Richards & others). New York: Round Table Press, Inc., 1935.

..... *Dogmatics in Outline* (trans. G. T. Thomson). New York: Philosophical Library, 1949.

Bartlett, Vernon. *East of the Iron Curtain.* New York: Medill McBride Co., 1950.

Beard, Charles A. *The Devil Theory of War.* New York: The Vanguard Press, Inc., 1936.

..... & Mary R. Beard. *A Basic History of the United States.* New York: The New Home Library, 1944.

..... *President Roosevelt and the Coming of the War 1941.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1948.

Bennett, John C. *Christianity and Communism.* New York: Association Press, 1951.

Benns, F. Lee. *Europe Since 1914.* Seventh ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1949.

Bergman, Gustav. "Logical Positivism." In Ferm, *A History of Philosophical Systems,* pp. 471-82.

Bernard, L. L. *War and Its Causes.* New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1944.

Bethe, Hans A. (Views on Hydrogen Bomb). "The Hydrogen Bomb": Legislative Reference Service, *Public Affairs Abstracts,* May, 1950, No. 9-3 (New Series). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Library of Congress.

Bible, The Holy. Revised Standard Version. New York: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1952.

Biological Warfare: "What You Should Know About Biological Warfare." (The Official Government Booklet). Washington, D. C.: Superintendent of Documents.

Braden, Charles Samuel. *War, Communism and World Religions.* New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1953.

Bradley, David. *No Place to Hide.* Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1949.

Brightman, Edgar Sheffield. *A Philosophy of Religion.* New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1940.

..... *Nature and Values.* New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, 1945.

..... "Persons and Values." Boston: Boston University Press, 1952.

Brown, Harrison. "Of Science and Men." In Chase (ed.), *Years of the Modern,* pp. 207-29.

Brunner, Emil. *Christianity and Civilisation.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949.

Buell, Raymond Leslie. *International Relations.* New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1925.

Bush, Vannevar. *Modern Arms and Free Men.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1949.

Byrnes, James F. *Speaking Frankly.* New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1947.

Carr, Edward Hallett. *Studies in Revolution.* London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1950.

Chambers, Frank P., Christina Phelps Harris & Charles C. Bayley. *This Age of Conflict.* Rev. ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1950.

Chandler, Albert R. *The Clash of Political Ideals.* Rev. ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1949.

Chase, John W. (ed.). *Years of the Modern.* New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1949.

Childs, Marquis W. *Sweden: The Middle Way.* Rev. ed. New York: Penguin Books, Inc., 1948.

Christian Century, The. (Editorial), July 8, 1953, pp. 790-91. "Could Any Good Come Out of Bermuda?"

Cousins, Norman. *Modern Man Is Obsolete.* New York: The Viking Press, 1945.

Davidson, Bill. "Our Wonder Weapons." *Collier's,* April 5, 1952, p. 15.

Dean, Vera Micheles. "For 'A More Perfect Union.'" *The Christian Century,* July 15, 1953, pp. 816-17.

Dewey, John. *The Quest For Certainty.* New York: Minton, Balch & Co., 1929.

..... *Human Nature and Conduct.* New York: The Modern Library, 1930.

DeWolf, L. Harold. *The Religious Revolt Against Reason.* New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1949.

Douglas, William O. (Keynote address at Philadelphia Bulletin Forum, March 3, 1952). Reprinted as "Justice Douglas Appeals for Rebirth of Freedom," by American Friends Service Committee.

Dulles, John Foster. *War or Peace.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1950.

du Noüy, Lecomte. *Human Destiny.* New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1947.

Eddy, Sherwood. *God in History.* New York: Association Press, 1947.

Einstein, Albert. "A Message to Intellectuals." In *Out of My Later Years,* pp. 152-55. New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1950.

..... (Views on Hydrogen Bomb). "The Hydrogen Bomb": Legislative Reference Service, *Public Affairs Abstracts,* May, 1950, No. 9-1 (New Series). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Library of Congress.

Eisenhower, Dwight D. *Crusade in Europe.* Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1948.

..... "State-of-the-Union Message." *The Detroit Free Press,* Feb. 3, 1953, p. 8.

..... (Address to American Society of Newspaper Editors). *The Detroit Free Press,* April 17, 1953, pp. 20-21.

Eliot, Charles W. (ed.). *The Harvard Classics,* Vol. 2. New York: P. F. Collier & Son Co., 1909.

Eliot, George Fielding. "The Job Ahead for Air Power." *U. S. A.: The Magazine of American Affairs,* April, 1952, pp. 27-35.

Epictetus. "The Golden Sayings of Epictetus." In Eliot (ed.), *The Harvard Classics,* Vol. 2, pp. 117-82.

Farley, Miriam S. "The Korean Crisis and the United Nations." In Rosinger and Associates, *The State of Asia,* pp. 155-79.

Fay, Sidney Bradshaw. *The Origins of the World War.* Two vols. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1928, 1929.

Feigl, Herbert. "Logical Empiricism." In Runes (ed.), *Twentieth Century Philosophy,* pp. 373-416.

Fenichell, Stephen S., and Philip Andrews. *The United Nations.* Philadelphia: The John C. Winston Co., 1951.

Ferm, Vergilius (ed.). *A History of Philosophical Systems.* New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1950.

Flewelling, Ralph Tyler. *The Survival of Western Culture.* New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1943.

Fortune, May, 1953, pp. 109-10, 230. "The Hidden Struggle for the H-Bomb."

Gibbon, Edward. *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,* Vol. I. In the Modern Library. New York: Random House, Inc., n.d.

Graham, Billy. *Peace with God.* New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1953.

Gunther, John. *Behind the Curtain.* New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1949.

Hammarskjold, Dag. "New Ways to Collective Security Without Vengeance." *United Nations Reporter,* July, 1953, p. 6.

Harrison, John B. *This Age of Global Strife.* Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1952.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm. *The Philosophy of History* (trans. J. Sibree). Rev. ed. New York: Willey Book Co., 1900.

Heiden, Konrad. *Der Fuehrer* (trans. Ralph Manheim). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1944.

Hersey, John. *Hiroshima.* New York: Bantam Books, 1948.

Hinshaw, David. *Sweden: Champion of Peace.* New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1949.

Hocking, William Ernest. *Thoughts on Death and Life.* New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1937.

Holliday, W. T. "Our Final Choice." (Reprint of original). *The Reader's Digest,* Jan., 1948.

Hopkins, Washburn E. *Ethics of India.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1924. London: Oxford University Press.

Jeans, Sir James. *The Mysterious Universe.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1934. Cambridge, England: At the University Press.

Jung, Carl Gustav. *Psychology and Religion.* New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939.

Kant, Immanuel. *Perpetual Peace.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1939.

Kennan, George F. *American Diplomacy 1900-1950.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1951.

Krikorian, Yervant H. (ed.). *Naturalism and the Human Spirit.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1944.

Krutch, Joseph Wood. *The Modern Temper.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., Inc., 1920.

Lapp, Ralph E. *The New Force.* New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1953.

Lawson, Ruth C. "The United Nations: Disarmament and Propaganda." *Current History,* April, 1952, pp. 216-20.

Leber, Charles Tudor (ed.). *World Faith in Action.* New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., Inc., 1951.

Leighton, Alexander H. *Human Relations in a Changing World.* New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1949.

Lenin, N. *The State and Revolution* (excerpt). In Chandler, *The Clash of Political Ideals,* pp. 181-94.

Lewis, C. S. *The Abolition of Man.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1947.

Lilge, Frederick. *The Abuse of Learning.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1948.

Lindley, Ernest K. "More Bombs, Less Security." *Newsweek,* May 5, 1952, p. 30.

Lippman, Walter. *The Cold War.* New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1947.

..... "Do We Face New Era?" *The Detroit Free Press,* Section B, July 5, 1953, p. 1.

MacArthur, Douglas. *Revitalizing a Nation.* Chicago: The Heritage Foundation, Inc., 1952.

Machiavelli, Niccolo. *The Prince* (trans. Luigi Ricci, rev. by E. R. P. Vincent). New York: The New American Library, 1952.

Markham, Edwin. *The Nail-Torn God.* In Wallis (ed.), *Poems of Edwin Markham,* p. 99.

Marshak, Robert E., and others. *Our Atomic World.* Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1946.

Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *The Communist Manifesto.* In Chandler, *The Clash of Political Ideals,* pp. 158-80.

Masters, Dexter, and Katharine Way. *One World or None.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1946.

Maurer, Herryman. *Collision of East and West.* Chicago: Henry Regnery Co., 1951.

Mayer, Frederick. *A History of Ancient & Medieval Philosophy.* New York: American Book Co., 1950.

Morrison, Philip. "If the Bomb Gets Out of Hand." In Masters and Way, *One World or None,* pp. 1-6.

Munk, Arthur W. *History and God.* New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1952.

..... "The Basis of Authority in Religion." *The Journal of Bible and Religion,* Vol. XX, No. 4, Oct., 1952, pp. 255-59.

McCarthy, Senator Joe. *McCarthyism.* New York: The Devin-Adair Co., Publishers, 1952.

McCune, Shannon. "Korea." In Rosinger and Associates, *The State of Asia,* pp. 129-54.

McKeon, Richard (ed.). *The Basic Works of Aristotle.* New York: Random House, Inc., 1941.

Niebuhr, Reinhold. *The Irony of American History.* New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1952.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Thus Spake Zarathustra* (trans. Thomas Common). In the Modern Library. New York: Random House, n.d.

Nixon, Justin Wroe. *Responsible Christianity.* New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1950.

Northrop, F. S. C. *The Taming of the Nations.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1952.

Noss, John B. *Man's Religions.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1949.

Patterson, Charles H. "Can Man Know God?" *The Journal of Bible and Religion,* Vol. XX, No. 3, July, 1952, pp. 176-81.

Plato. *The Republic* (trans. and ed. Francis M. Cornford). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941.

Poling, Paul Newton (ed.). *God and the Nations.* Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1950.

Ponsonby, Arthur, M. P. *Falsehood in War-time.* New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1928.

Posin, Daniel Q. *I Have Been to the Village.* Ann Arbor: Edwards Brothers, Inc., 1948.

Raven, Charles E. *War and the Christian.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1938.

Reichenbach, Hans. *The Rise of Scientific Philosophy.* Berkeley and Los Angeles: The University of California Press, 1951.

Rosinger, Lawrence K., and Associates. *The State of Asia.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1951.

..... "India." In Rosinger and Associates, *The State of Asia,* pp. 443-88.

Runes, Dagobert D. (ed.). *Twentieth Century Philosophy.* New York: Philosophical Library, Inc., 1947.

Smith, Howard K. *The State of Europe.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1949.

Smith, Walter Bedell. *My Three Years in Moscow.* Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1949.

Somerville, John. *Soviet Philosophy.* New York: Philosophical Library, 1946.

..... *The Philosophy of Peace.* New York: Gaer Associates, 1949.

Sorokin, Pitirim A. *The Crisis of Our Age.* New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1942.

..... *Social Philosophies in Conflict.* Boston: The Beacon Press, 1950.

..... "Nine Theses on War and Peace." In Poling (ed.), *God and the Nations,* pp. 106-28.

Spengler, Oswald. *The Decline of the West* (trans. Charles Francis Atkinson). In two vols. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1928, 1929.

..... *Man and Technics* (trans. Charles Francis Atkinson). New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1932.

..... *The Hour of Decision* (trans. Charles Francis Atkinson). New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 1934.

Stalin, Joseph. "Stalin on Lenin's Contributions to Marxism." In Chandler, *The Clash of Political Ideals,* pp. 194-98.

Sternberg, Fritz. *The Coming Crisis* (trans. from the German by Edward Fitzgerald). New York: The John Day Co., 1947.

Stevenson, Adlai. "Report by Adlai Stevenson." *Look,* May 19, 1953, pp. 29-35.

Stockwell, F. Olin. *With God in Red China.* New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1953.

Swombley, John M. *The Road to War 1945-1951.* Washington, D. C.: National Council Against Conscription, n.d.

Thomas, Elbert D. *This Nation Under God.* New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1950.

Toynbee, Arnold J. *Civilization on Trial.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1948.

..... *War and Civilization* (selected by Albert Vann Fowler from *A Study of History*). New York: Oxford University Press, 1950.

..... *The World and the West.* New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1953.

Trueblood, Benjamin F. *The Development of the Peace Idea.* Boston: Copyright by Sarah H. Trueblood, 1932.

Trueblood, D. Elton. *The Predicament of Modern Man.* New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1944.

U. S. Scientific Laboratory. The Effects of Atomic Weapons. Washington, D. C.: The Combat Forces Press, 1950.

United States Strategic Bombing Survey, The. Effects of Atomic Bombs on Health and Medical Services in Hiroshima and Naga-

saki. (Medical Division). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1947.

Urey, Harold C. (Views on Hydrogen Bomb). "The Hydrogen Bomb": Legislative Reference Service, *Public Affairs Abstracts,* May, 1950, No. 9-1 (New Series). Washington, D. C.: U. S. Library of Congress.

Van Kirk, Walter W. "Christians Must Wage Peace." *The Christian Advocate,* July 31, 1952, pp. 8-10, 26-27.

Wallis, Charles L. (ed.). *Poems of Edwin Markham.* New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1950.

Warburg, James P. *Faith, Purpose and Power.* New York: Farrar, Straus & Co., 1950.

Werkmeister, W. H. *A History of Philosophical Ideas in America.* New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1949.

World Almanac 1952, The. New York: *New York World-Telegram,* and *The Sun,* 1952.

World Almanac 1953, The. New York: *New York World-Telegram,* and *The Sun,* 1953.

Wright, Quincy. *A Study of War.* Two vols. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1942.

INDEX OF PERSONS[1]

Abbé de St. Pierre, 124
Abelard, 123
Albery, Michael, 89 n.
Alexander the Great, 104
Alsop, Joseph, 147 n., 148 n.
Alsop, Stewart, 90 n.
Amos, the Prophet, 121
Aquinas, St. Thomas, 49, 123
Aristotle, 30, 43 n., 107
Asoka, King, 122
Attlee, Clement, 116 n.
Augustine, St., 31, 43 n., 123

Barr, Stringfellow, 61 n., 141, 147 n., 148 nn.
Barry, F. R., 61 n.
Barth, Karl, 32-33, 43 n.
Beard, Charles A., 89 n., 91, 116 n., 117 nn.
Belshazzar, King, 125
Benns, F. Lee, 89 nn., 117 n., 147 n.
Bentham, Jeremy, 124
Berchtold, Count, 95
Bergmann, Gustav, 43 n.
Beria, Lavrenti P., 27 n.
Berkner, Lloyd V., 79
Bernard, L. L., 116 n., 117 n., 131 n.
Bethe, Hans, 80-81, 89 n.
Borah, William E., 69
Braden, Charles Samuel, 118 n., 147 n.
Bradley, David, 78, 89 n., 90 n.
Brightman, Edgar Sheffield, 26 n., 61 n.
Brown, Harrison, 27 n.
Buddha, 31, 49, 121
Buell, Raymond Leslie, 131 n.
Bush, Vannevar, 80, 81, 84, 90 n., 91 n.
Byrnes, James F., 27 n., 88 n.

Carr, Edward Hallett, 27 n.
Chambers-Harris-Bayley, 91 n., 117 n., 131 n., 147 n.
Chandler, Albert R., 28 n., 88 n.
Chiang Kai-shek, 141
Childs, Marquis W., 117 n.
Chisholm, Brock, 80, 90 n.
Comte, Auguste, 34
Confucius, 31, 49, 122
Constantine, 58
Cousins, Norman, 71, 89 n.
Cromwell, Oliver, 48
Czar, Nicholas II, 95, 110

Daniel, 125
Davidson, Bill, 27 n.
Democritus, 15, 19
Dewey, John, 17, 26 n., 44 n.
DeWolf, L. Harold, 43 n., 62 n.
Dibelius, Bishop, 140
Douglas, William O., 75, 89 n.
Dulles, John Foster, 145, 147 n., 148 n.
du Noüy, Lecomte, 49, 61 nn.

Eddy, Sherwood, 44 n., 50-51, 89 n.
Einstein, Albert, 79, 81, 83, 90 nn., 147 n.
Eisenhower, Dwight, 22, 27 n., 73, 74, 89 n., 127, 133
Eliot, George Fielding, 90 n.
Empedocles, 122
Engels, Friedrich, 88 n.

1 One (n.) signifies note, the singular, two (nn.) signifies two or more on the same page.

Epictetus, 61 n.
Euripides, 122

Farley, Miriam S., 132 n.
Fay, Sidney Bradshaw, 109, 112, 116 nn., 117 n., 118 n.
Fenichell and Andrews, 61 n., 148 n.
Flewelling, Ralph Tyler, 61 n.
Fox, George, 123
Francis, St., 123
Franco (Francisco Paulino), 48, 145
Franz Ferdinand, Archduke, 96, 103, 110

Gandhi, Mahatma, 32
Gibbon, Edward, 105, 117 n.
Graham, Billy, 33, 43 n.
Grey, Edward, 93
Grotius, Hugo, 123, 124
Gunther, John, 52, 61 n., 90 nn.

Habakkuk, the Prophet, 119
Harrison, John B., 117 n., 132 n.
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm, 16, 41, 44 n., 45, 49
Heiden, Konrad, 26 n., 36, 37, 44 nn.
Henry IV of France, 123
Heraclitus, 15, 19, 23
Hersey, John, 52, 89 n.
Hinshaw, David, 117 nn.
Hitler, Adolf, 16, 21, 25, 36-37, 42, 60, 69, 86, 87, 91, 104, 105, 108, 110, 113, 127
Hobbes, Thomas, 16
Hocking, William Ernest, 44 n.
Holliday, W. T., 117 n.

Ikhnaton, 121
Isaiah, the Prophet, 121
Izvolski, Alexander, 93

James, William, 107
Jeans, Sir James, 27 n.
Jeremiah, the Prophet, 121
Jesus, 31, 33, 103, 114, 115, 123
Jung, Carl Gustav, 44 n.

Kant, Immanuel, 31, 43 n., 49, 61 n., 124
Kennan, George F., 21
Krikorian, Yervant H., 26 n.

Lapp, Ralph E., 78, 81, 89 n., 90 nn., 147 n.
Lawson, Ruth C., 147 n.
Leber, Charles Tudor, 147 n.
Lie, Trygve, 130
Lilge, Frederick, 43 n., 44 n.
Lindley, Ernest K., 118 n.
Lippman, Walter, 89 n., 128, 132 n., 139, 147 n.

Machiavelli, Niccolo, 16
Malenkov, Georgi, 27 n.
Markham, Edwin, 53, 61 n.
Marx, Karl, 16, 66, 88 n.
Masters and Way, 90 n.
Maurer, Herryman, 115 n.
Mayer, Frederick, 131 n.
McCloy, John J., 60
McMahon, Brien, 142
Micah, the Prophet, 121
Morrison, Philip, 90 n.
Mo-ti, 31, 122
Munk, Arthur W., 25 n., 43 n., 61 nn.
Mussolini, Benito, 42, 86

Napoleon, 104, 113
Nehru, Jawaharlal, 130, 144, 148 n.
Niebuhr, Reinhold, 28 n.
Nietzsche, Friedrich, 16
Nixon, Justin Wroe, 26 n.
Northrop, F. S. C., 144, 148 n.
Noss, John B., 118 n.

Oppenheimer, J. Robert, 79, 82

Patterson, Charles H., 61 n.
Phillips, Morgan, 116 n.
Plato, 16, 25 n., 45, 49, 111, 122
Poincaré, Raymond, 93, 95
Ponsonby, Arthur, 86, 91 n.
Posin, Daniel, 78, 90 n., 91 n.

Raven, Charles E., 131 n.
Reichenbach, Hans, 34 ff., 37 ff., 43 n., 44 nn.
Reuther, Walter, 141
Rhee, Syngman, 128, 140
Roosevelt, Franklin D., 110
Rosinger, Lawrence K., 132 n., 147 n.

Sellars, Roy Wood, 17
Smith, Howard K., 67, 69, 88 nn., 89 nn., 90 n., 139, 147 n.
Smith, Walter Bedell, 88 n.
Socrates, 49
Somerville, John, 89 n.
Sophocles, 122
Sorokin, Pitirim, 68, 88, 88 n., 91 n.

Spengler, Oswald, 16, 26 nn., 29
Stalin, Joseph, 20-21
Stevenson, Adlai, 147 n.
Stockwell, F. Olin, 148 n.
Swombley, John M., 118 n.

Thomas, Elbert D., 28 n.
Tito, Marshal, 127
Tojo, Hideki, 86
Toynbee, Arnold J., 25, 28 n., 61 n., 65-66, 88 n., 117 nn.
Trajan, Emperor, 105
Trotsky, Leon, 20
Trueblood, Benjamin, 131 n.
Trueblood, D. Elton, 44 n.
Truman, Harry S., 21, 27 n., 74, 116 n., 133, 142

Urey, Harold C., 79, 90 n.

Vandenberg, Hoyt S., 79

Werkmeister, W. H., 17, 26 n.
William II, Kaiser Wilhelm, 86, 91, 96
Wilson, Woodrow, 95
Wright, Quincy, 89 nn., 112, 116 n., 117 n., 118 n.

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

Absolutism, dogmatic, 41-43
Action: need of thoughtful, 133-34
Africa, 101, 105
Agadir Crisis, 96
America, American, 24, 39, 75, 96, 97, 120, 129, 133, 134, 138, 139, 141, 145; see also United States
American criticism of Russia, 65-67
Anarchism, 39, 107
Apocalypticism; see philosophies
Arabia, Arabs, 97, 129
Armaments:
  arms race, 20-26, 73, 112-13
  cost of, 73-74, 142
  dangers of, 112-13, 142-43
  relation to war, 112
Asia, Asians, Oriental, 22, 98, 99, 101, 143
Assistance Program, 141-43
Assyrian Empire, 97
Astronomer, 51
Atomic:
  age, 78, 120, 125 ff.
  bombs, 21, 22, 78-80, 83-84, 125
  control of, 138-39
  Energy Commission, 130
Atoms:
  old theory of, 15, 19
  new theory of, 19, 23
Austria, Austrian, 25, 73, 96, 108
Axis nations, 98, 99

Babylonian Empire, 97
Bank of International Settlements, 72
Beauty, 52
Behaviorism, 18, 38, 51
Belgium, 73
Berlin Blockade, 96, 129
Bhagavad Gita, 122
Bikini tests, 78
Biological warfare, 80
Biologist, 51
Birth Control, 94, 105
Black Death, 30, 121
Bosnia, 96
Buddhism, 46, 52 and n., 115, 122
Business, 101, 143; see also trade

Canada, 73, 140
Capitalism, 17, 66, 93, 98
Causes of war:
  basic, 97-116
  biological and psychological, 102-07
  geographical and economic, 97-102
  historical, 113-14
  ideological, 15-43, 95, 114-15
  ignorance, 115-16, 146
  immediate, 95-96
  increasing knowledge of, 120-21
  militaristic, 111-13
  political, 107-11
China, 25, 67, 75, 96, 101, 114, 122-23, 131, 136, 141
Christianity, Christian, 31, 46, 52, 58, 114-15, 123, 131; see also Church, Jesus
Church, 33-34, 58, 123, 138, 147 n.
Class struggle, 16-17
Clergy, 33
Cold War, 126-27, 129, 137, 144
Communism, Communists, 15-17, 20-21, 22, 24, 25, 47, 58, 75, 91, 93, 106, 127, 139; see also Russia, Russians
Congress, 73, 142
Containment, policy of, 21
Cooperatives, 100
Crisis, 15, 20-22
Crusades, 115

Cuba, 140
Czechoslovakia, 25, 67

Democracy, 17-18, 24-25, 27 n., 39-40, 52, 70, 74-76, 105
Denmark, 100
Depression, 71, 99-100, 144
Disarmament, 113, 138-139
Dutch, 72-73, 129
Education, 105, 113, 116, 117 n., 146

Egypt, Egyptian, 42, 97, 101, 121
Enemy:
  the supposed, 65-71
  the real; see war
Energy theory of matter; see atoms, new theory of
England; see Great Britain
Eniwetok Atoll test, 80
Europe, European, 98, 101, 102, 103, 120, 128, 130, 144
Evil as problem, 54-56

Fascism, 17, 20, 24, 42, 66, 75, 139
Fatalism, 29-31, 58, 94
Fate, 29, 120
Fear, 103
Feudalism, 77
Food and Agricultural Organization, 129, 130
Force: dangers in use of, 24, 59
France, 72, 73, 74, 75, 97, 98, 99, 103, 108, 146
Freedom; see democracy
Freudians, 51
Friends, Society of, 27-28 n., 32, 89 nn., 123, 148 n.

Gas, poisonous: why not used, 83-84
Germany, Germans, 37, 72, 73, 75, 77, 86, 95, 97, 99, 103, 108, 127, 130, 139, 140, 143
God, 16, 18, 29-30, 32, 33, 53-58, 120, 121
Grand Design, 123
Great Britain, 72, 73, 98, 99, 108, 130
Greece, Greek, 15, 122
Gregariousness, 104
Gunpowder, 77, 83

Hague Conferences, 124
Hate, 103
Hebrew Kingdom, 97
Herzegovinia, 96
Hinduism, 61 n., 122
Hiroshima, 78, 86
History: two false views, 109
Holland; see Dutch
Hope:
  signs of, 119-31
  of hopelessness, 119-20
Humanism, 17, 51-53
Hydrogen Bomb, 22, 80-81, 83

Idealism, 17, 23-24, 58-60, 133
Ideals, norms, standards, 23, 24, 40-41
Ideas, 23, 24, 27 n.
Ideologies; see causes of war
Imperialism, 41, 99, 101, 114, 143-44
India, 101, 122, 129, 130, 137, 141, 144
Indonesians, 129
Industrialism, industrialization, 18-19, 51, 141
Iran, 101, 129
Ireland, 73
Islam, 31, 114, 115
Israel, 129; see also Jews, Judaism
Italy, 72, 74, 75, 139

Japan, Japanese, 42, 75, 86, 87, 102, 114, 130, 139
Jews, 77, 86
Judaism, 31, 52
Justice, 50
  International Court of, 129

Korea, Koreans, 21, 59, 125, 126, 127-28, 134, 139, 140, 145
Korean War; see war

Labor, International Organization of, 102
Land reform: need of, 101
League of Nations, 60, 124-25, 129
Lebanon, 129
Life, 36, 53, 119
Logical Positivism, 34
Love, 103, 122-23
Lusitania, 95

Man, 15, 16, 52, 56, 98, 107
Marshall Plan, 108
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 82
Materialism, 15-26, 26 n.
Matter, 16, 18
McCarran Act, 75
Metaphysics, 17, 26 n.
Mexico, 140
Middle Ages, 120

Militarism, 20-22, 24-26, 95, 104-05, 111-13
Mind, 16, 18
Moral Law, 49-50, 121
Moral pressure, 59-60
Moroccan Crisis, 96

Nagasaki, 78, 86
Nationalism, 20, 46, 103, 107-08, 140, 144
Naturalism, 15, 17-18; see also materialism
Nazism, 17, 20, 24, 41, 52, 66, 72, 75, 77, 139
Negroes, 69
Neutral nations, 130-31, 136-37
Newspapers and war, 108
North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 94, 109, 128

Occupation: recall of armies of, 139-40
Overpopulation, 101, 141

Pacifism, 24, 27 n., 114, 115, 121-23
Pakistan, 129
Panama Canal, 117 n.
Paris, Pact of, 147 n.
Patriotism, 105, 113
Peace:
  growing vision of, 121-25
  need of synoptic approach, 92-95, 134-35
  need of total mobilization for, 146
  new, bold, universal, endeavor toward, 135-37
  peace-minded minorities, 131
  philosophy of, 45-61, 133
  Society, 124
  steps toward, 134-46
Personalism, 51-53
Personality:
  dwarfing of, 51-52
  significance of, 52
Philosophies:
  apocalyptic, 32-34
  dogmatic, 41-43
  escapist, 32-37
  fatalistic, 29-31
  of power, 15-27, 111, 115
  positivism, 34-37
  relativistic, 37-41
Philosophy:
  contributions to peace, 46-47
  essentials of adequate, 45-61
  relations to religion; see religion
Physicist, 51
Point Four, 142
Poland, Poles, 77, 86
Positivism; see philosophies
Poverty, 30, 141-43
Power, lust for, 103, 104, 106
Profits, 99-100
Propaganda, 86, 109
Prophets of Israel, 31, 121
Psychologists, 51
Purpose, Divine or Cosmic, 16, 18, 34, 53-58

Race, racial, 102, 105-06
Radioactivity, 78
Realism, 59-60, 133
Reason, rational, 32, 35-36, 47, 70-71
Relativism; see philosophies
Religion, 32-34, 95, 114
  contributions to peace, 46, 121-25
  Marxian view of, 67
  relation to philosophy, 45, 57
Republicans, 22
Rights, Universal Declaration of Human, 53, 57
Rome, Roman, 42, 58, 74, 123
Russia, Russian, 20-21, 24-25, 50, 60, 65 ff., 73, 79, 82, 86, 96, 98, 103, 104, 108, 114, 126 f., 133, 134, 136-37, 138, 139, 140, 142, 143, 145
  cost of wars to, 69, 72
  criticism of America, 68-70
  invasions of, 69
  things in common with United States, 70-71
  see also Communism

Sarajevo, 95, 96, 97
Schuman Plan, 101, 144
Science, scientists, 19, 27 nn., 35, 100, 131, 146
Security, desire for, 103
Serbia, 95, 97, 108
Shintoism, 114
Sin, war as the great, 57
Slavery, 30
Sophists, 16
Soviet Union; see Russia
Spain, 98, 136, 145
Stoics, 61 n., 122
Suez Canal, 117 n.
Sweden, 97, 100, 117 n., 130
Switzerland, 130, 136
Syria, 129

Taoism, 122
Tariffs, 100-101, 143
Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), 141
  need for World TVA, 141-42
Theism, 53-58
Titans, struggle of, 15 ff., 126-27; see also Russia and United States
Totalitarianism, 38, 41-43, 104, 111; see also Fascism and Nazism
Trade, 100-101, 143-44
Truth, 35, 48-49

United Nations, 48, 50, 53, 58, 59, 60, 93-94, 102, 106, 125, 128-30, 135, 136, 137, 141-43, 144
  and Korean War, 144-45
  as symbol of hope, 128-30
  as symbol of unity, 129
  as world's conscience, 130
  organizations within, 129-30
  per capita cost to Americans, 61 n.
  practical achievements, 129
  strengthening of, 144-46
United States, 18, 25, 60, 65 ff., 73, 79, 98, 99, 100, 105, 109, 114, 125, 126 ff., 136
  cost of wars to, 71 ff., 142
  dangers of fascism, 22, 75-76
  national debt, 73-74
  things in common with Russia, 70-71
  see also America, American
Universal military training, 75, 125
Universality and comprehensiveness, 46-47
Universe as purposive, 53-58

Versailles, Treaty of, 60, 108
Victory, intoxication of, 25
V-1 and V-2 rockets, 82

War:
  as archaic and futile, 25, 59
  as inevitable, 29-30
  as not inevitable, 30-31
  as real enemy, 65-91
  causes of; see causes
  crime and, 85
  Devil Theory of, 92-93, 104, 116
  human costs of, 76-84
  material costs of, 71-74
  moral and spiritual costs of, 85-88
  political costs of, 74-76
  psychological attraction of, 104-105, 106
  repudiation of, 137-38
Wars:
  Balkan, 96
  Boer, 96
  First World War, 72, 75, 77, 84, 85, 99, 105, 107, 108, 117 n., 124
  Franco-Prussian, 113
  Italo-Turkish, 96
  Korean, 24, 59, 71, 96, 117 n., 125, 126, 127, 128, 137, 140, 144-45
  Napoleonic, 99
  Russo-Japanese, 96
  Spanish-American, 99
  Second World War, 72-73, 75, 77-78, 83, 84, 86, 98, 99, 100, 108, 124, 126
  Third World War, a possible, 71-88, 96, 101, 127, 129, 138
  Thirty Years War, 77, 83, 95
  Warsaw, 77
  Weather and climate, 94
  World Conference, 135, 136-37
  World emergency, 135
  World federalism, 93-94, 110
  World government, 93-94, 110, 146
  World Peace Month, 136

Yalu River, 96
Yugoslavia, 127

Zoroastrianism, 114

Date Due

~~NEW BOOK~~			
OC 11 '54			
JAN 2 8 '57			
~~FACULTY~~			
~~NOV 25 '59~~			
~~DEC 9 '59~~			

JX1952.M96
A way of survival.
Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 00003 5560